

The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1870.

The Week.

NOTHING can be said to have been settled by the week's work in Congress, except the League Island Bill, which was tabled in the House on Wednesday, the 26th, and for this we ought to feel thankful to Mr. Dawes in particular. We must also do him the justice to say that he did not criticise the estimates of the Administration until he or others of the Ways and Means Committee had applied at headquarters for information. Mr. Butler's reply to his argument for retrenchment appears to have consisted in procuring slightly reduced or corrected estimates from the Departments, and thus, of course, altering somewhat Mr. Dawes's standard of comparison; but the difference was not great, and the latter's rejoinder served rather to strengthen his original position. We observe, too, that Mr. Dawes's appeal to the people of Massachusetts to judge between his political career and that of his colleague, has not resulted in Gen. Butler's favor. Under the lead of Mr. Hill, of New Jersey, the House on Thursday abolished, so far as its action could, the franking privilege, in a much shorter time than is usually needed for so advanced and (to Congressmen) self-sacrificing a measure, and by a handsome majority. The Senate is likely to amend but not to resist it. Until new provisions are made for the payment of postage on newspapers and periodicals, the reform, like other hastily considered measures, may be productive of trouble between publishers and their subscribers, as well as between exchanges. The law as it passed the House is to take effect July 1. The Virginia members have been admitted to the House—Fernando Wood, in the case of Mr. Porter, paying homage to the memory of President Lincoln and his war government—and to the Senate. The Senate has done little else than discuss finance.

The discussion in the Senate during the week has been mainly over Mr. Sherman's Currency Bill, proposing to issue \$45,000,000 more National Bank currency, withdrawing the same amount of three per cent. certificates, and compelling the banks to keep on hand twenty-five per cent. of their circulation in gold. The main object of the bill is to "equalize" the circulation, as it is called, by giving the Western and Southern States, which have fewer national banks than the Eastern, their "fair share" of the paper money of the country. We discussed this subject at full length in April last year (No. 197), when similar measures were under discussion, taking the ground that no matter how you "distribute the circulation," it will flow where it is wanted in the transaction of business, and will only stay where people can afford to keep it; that if the West or South want more currency, they can always have it by coming to the East and buying it with their products; and that there is no way of getting it except by purchase, unless the Government should present it to them for nothing, which, we believe, Mr. Sherman does not propose it should do. He requires each new bank organized under his bill to deposit 90 per cent. of its circulation in Government bonds; but if the West or South have bonds to deposit in setting up banks, they can go and sell them, or borrow money on them, in Wall Street, and thus get nearly the same amount of money; but if they have not the bonds, or the means of buying them, they cannot set up the banks. Of course, banking under the National system is profitable, and plenty of men will be ready to go into it under Mr. Sherman's bill; but that anybody will be able, by means of the bill, to keep currency in any particular section of the country in which business does not require it, and in which it would not stay of itself without an act of Congress, we look on as a curious and interesting delusion. Currency is plenty at the East because capital is mainly owned at the East, which is another way of saying that rich men have a great deal of money and poor men very little; and Congress-

sional devices for equalizing the distribution of the currency are like plans for equalizing fortunes, or making Venice as prosperous as London, or making water run up hill. The debates of the week, therefore, will carry everybody who takes this view of the matter back a good way into the past.

While the franking privilege still remains in force, it could scarcely be used to better purpose than in distributing copies of Mr. Blake's report concerning the Indians of British America, submitted to the House on Thursday. Mr. Blake is United States Consul at Hamilton, Canada, and he was instructed to examine into the condition of the various tribes living under the rule of the Dominion, with a view to getting light on their progress in civilization, and the measures adopted to remove the distinctions between them and the French and English population. His observations showed that during the last fifty years there has been no difficulty with the Indians or among themselves; that the Government has given them reservations, without ceasing to care for and protect them, especially by extending medical attendance and enforcing vaccination; that they take kindly to schools and education, because it puts them on an equality with white men; that some of them are, in fact, indistinguishable from the whites in manners and cultivation; that as a whole they are increasing in numbers—apparent decrease in some cases being attributable to emigration or to intermarriage and social fusion with the whites; in short, that they "have passed through the most critical era of transition from barbarism to civilization." This is true, while it is also true that many of the Indians are still addicted to the pagan worship of their forefathers; but the wise conduct of the Government has made it morally certain that these last will eventually be brought up to the level of the others in customs and intelligence. There is a lesson in this spectacle which even the inhabitants of Minnesota might receive if they would, and our border population generally; and we hope that even before this country undertakes to annex Canada, it will annex its Indian policy. For this no reciprocity treaty is needed.

Apropos of the public debt, there is one curious thing in connection with the Democratic policy about it which we would thank our ingenious contemporary, the *World*, to explain. The Democratic party, we are constantly told, are in favor of the punctual and loyal payment of the debt, which is all very well; but then, how does it happen that all, or nearly all, Democrats are in favor of paying it in greenbacks? Republicans differ occasionally about the "meaning of the contract," but how is it that Democrats are always of one mind about the meaning of the contract, and never, by any chance, fall into the error of supposing that the bondholder is entitled to gold? Surely one might expect some of them to go astray now and then on so knotty a question. When Mr. McNeely, of Kentucky, proposed to declare the fifties payable in greenbacks in the House on Monday, his resolution was only laid on the table by a strict party vote.

A negro, Mr. Revels, has been elected senator from Mississippi, and is awaiting the admission of the State to take his seat; and in the interval, some of the newspapers have been entertaining themselves with the discussion of his eligibility under the Dred Scott decision—some holding that he only became a citizen at the passage of the Fourteenth Amendment, and, therefore, cannot sit in the Senate till the lapse of nine years from that date. Even if, however, the majority in either House were likely to accept the Dred Scott decision, as including not only slaves but free blacks, in the teeth of the historical evidence as to the recognition of negro citizenships in the earlier days of the Republic, they would be delivered from all difficulty in the matter by the practice of the Government, even under Democratic auspices, in the annexation of foreign territory. The Texans became citizens forthwith on the

annexation of the Republic to the United States; the people of St. Thomas and the Dominicans will do the same—a proposition to keep them waiting nine years would be laughed at; and the argument of expediency is still stronger in the case of our native blacks than in their case. There is a touch of the comic in Mr. Revels's being the successor of Jefferson Davis.

General Butler seems to meet with no favor in any quarter in his new rôle of a defender of the Administration. The Republican press, as far as our observation goes, abuse or reprove him, partly, apparently, owing to a general want of confidence in him, and partly owing to his attack on Mr. Dawes, which, being in the nature of an attempt to "read him out" of the Republican party, was, coming from the General, absurd as well as unseemly, as Mr. Dawes had no difficulty in pointing out. Mr. Dawes's onslaught on the Administration we thought, as we said a week ago, ill-judged, because it is a kind of attack against which it is impossible to defend one's self without notice, and against which, even with notice, it is very difficult for the Government to defend itself at all. The difficulties of its position could hardly be better illustrated than by its having to let General Butler appear for it. The real weight of Mr. Dawes's character and services of course rendered his assault all the more serious. As far as he is concerned, however, he has every reason to congratulate himself, as it has been the means of calling forth in every direction the strongest tributes to his worth, in which we cordially concur. It has had, too, the good effect of revealing in a very marked way the decline of General Butler, even in the estimation of the noisy and unscrupulous band of worshippers who rallied round him two years ago. A few months more, and he will have once more adjusted himself to a peaceful state of society and the normal calm of the public mind, and will count for no more now than he did before the war, to the great gain of political morality and of the public credit.

The Tennessee Constitutional Convention, which began its sessions with an apparent intention to abrogate everything which the Radicals had enacted, seems to improve with length of days. The question of the franchise has been thoroughly debated during the week, and the opponents of negro suffrage have been signally defeated in an attempt to get the franchise clause, which makes no distinction of color, submitted separately to the popular vote. This saves it, since a majority of the people would undoubtedly vote it down, unless by so doing they risked the Amended Constitution at the same time. The *Memphis Post* thinks the Convention's liberality is due to a wholesome fear inspired by the Georgia precedent; but the tone of the arguments used by prominent ex-Confederates is against the supposition. There is, in fact, no reason why a former secessionist in Tennessee should not be prompter to recognize existing facts than a Democrat in Illinois, both being engaged in adjusting Constitutions to altered times. In the South Carolina Legislature a colored senator has been chosen Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, with the aid of the entire Democratic vote.

Mr. Wells was accused by the *Tribune* (Jan. 13) of untruthfulness in his estimate of the wool-clip of the United States in 1868, in having asserted that the wool-clip was only four and three-quarters pounds per head of sheep, and that the total clip of that year was 177,000,000 pounds; and it styled him "a Special Munchausen who thus figured up the statement that it is a waste of capital to invest more money in woollen spindles." To which Mr. Wells replied that he never estimated the clip per head of sheep at four and three-quarters pounds or any other figure, and that his estimate of the total was taken from the Bulletin of the Woollen Manufacturers' Association, and had been adopted by Mr. E. B. Bigelow, the well-known protectionist, in his address before the American Institute (Mr. Horace Greeley, president), Oct. 5, 1869. Of this the *Tribune* took no notice till Monday last—an interval of a fortnight—when, being goaded by the *Detroit Free Press*, it announced that Mr. Wells had not contradicted its charge (of being a "Special Munchausen"), but had simply said that his estimate was taken from "recent essays by Messrs. Bigelow and Hayes," and that, had "he mentioned in his report that his

estimates had been borrowed, it would not have held him responsible for their accuracy." Here we see a man is accused of lying, partly by imputing to him a statement he never made, and partly by denying the correctness of one he did make. He denies that he made the first statement, and shows that he adopted the second from a trusted friend and colleague of his accuser; but his accuser takes no notice of the defence, and, more than that, uses the special and peculiar means at his disposal to prevent the public from hearing of it. What does Mr. Greeley think of the morality of this kind of editing? We should really like to know, not for the purpose of harassing him hereafter, but as an interesting contribution to the sociology of the day.

When he is in the way of explaining, we wish he would also define the *Tribune's* position about capital punishment. It frequently contains wild articles, strongly denunciatory of the death penalty, and in so doing without suggesting any substitute, has done much to throw the public mind into great confusion on a very important question. The death penalty is disappearing, like some better things, before a kind of mushy and unthinking doubt of its morality and expediency; but hardly anybody is giving any sober attention to the provision of a certain mode of removing manslaughterers from human society—a thing which no civilized community can dispense with, if it means to preserve any sentiment of respect for human life. The *Tribune*, however, not only renders no help in this matter, but, when it gets into hysterics over a murder like the McFarland or the Townsend case, seems to forget all about its views on capital punishment, and not only calls for the death of the criminal, but his death without trial. Apropos of the Townsend murder on Sunday last, it exclaimed on Monday morning: "If a few of these criminals could be made to suffer the extreme penalty of their acts before the burial of their victims, we might hope to awe their fellows into something like regard for their necks, if not for the laws of the State." Here is actually a suggestion that murderers should be hanged within two days from the death of their victims—that is, substantially without trial—emanating from a paper which maintains about one hundred times a year that all legal killing is wicked and unnecessary.

The *Sun* accuses us of indicating, by our remarks last week on "Editorial Perspective," our belief that the daily papers should have passed over the Cooke scandal in total silence. That was not our idea. What we meant to say, and we hoped had succeeded in saying, was that an editor's duty was not only to lay the facts of the day before the public, but to indicate, by the greater or less prominence he gives them, the relations of each fact to other facts. The space and prominence given to the Cooke abduction would have been justified if it were in any way a symptomatic fact, or if it were likely to be followed by serious consequences to the community—if, for instance, it was a sign of the state of morals in Methodist churches or in public schools, or if the probable result of it would be that other ministers would follow Cooke's example, or if Cooke had been in any way a prominent or widely known or influential man. But none of these things was true. The incident was nothing more than the elopement of an apparently half-cracked minister with a silly girl. It was right to give an account of it; but to give up whole columns to it day after day; to send out reporters right and left to scour the country for "items" about Cooke's life; to speculate about him, and his motives and whereabouts, as if his crime was unprecedented; to pester his unfortunate wife to let the public know how *she* felt, the unfortunate school-girl's father to know how *he* felt; and, in short, expend as much time, money, and nervous force on the working of it up as if it were a revolution or a tremendous public calamity, or the revelation of a great social sore, was to give the public a totally false impression of the real value and true place of the incident, and what is worse, was to foster and encourage one of the most depraved of human tastes—the appetite for *dirty* scandal. This is as well as we can state in a few lines our position about it. The *Sun* will hardly maintain that an editor has no right to exercise his own judgment as to the importance of what he publishes, or that he is bound to think *only* of the number of people who will be likely to want to know a thing, in deciding what space he will give to it; because this would fill every paper with simple obscenity.

The news from France continues to be peaceful, and shows that the new ministry grows in strength and confidence. M. Ollivier has addressed the Senate in explanation and defence of his policy, and received, in return, a strong vote of confidence. The press, generally, treats the issue of the struggles of the last year as proof positive that Frenchmen are vastly better politicians than they were forty years ago; that they want liberty, but not revolution; and that they have come to understand that revolution means the destruction of popular confidence in free government, and the increase of the tendency to take refuge in dictatorships; and that the pretence of the Parisian Reds, that they are competent to form a republic which people who have to earn their bread and provide for their children by other means than public spouting will consent to live under, is simply farcical. Their latest advice to the Republicans is, not to pay rent or taxes; and Rochefort's remedy for the anomaly known as the "High Court," which is to try Prince Pierre, is to have "the people take arms and administer justice for themselves." The additional details which have appeared about the murder show that, as far as regards the dirty abuse which led to it, the prince and the journalist were about on a level. The former had, in a Corsican paper, delicately expressed a wish to have the "tripes cut out" of the Republicans of that island, and used as manure. This the statesmen of the *Marseillaise*, whose own language is only one degree better, could not endure, and, accordingly, the Corsican member of the staff, M. Paul Grousset, sent to demand satisfaction for it, and everybody knows the rest. The melancholy feature of the affair is that it should be possible, in this age, for a great nation, one of the foremost, if not the foremost, in civilization—the country of Royer-Collard, Constant, Guizot, De Broglie, and Montalembert—to be convulsed, and its peaceful progress absolutely impeded, by the quarrels of men of this sort, without mind or manners or morals, using their pens mainly to fling garbage at their enemies, and wearing pistols and daggers to supplement their mutual vituperation.

The only apparently positive and reliable news from Rome is, that the hope of getting the Pope made infallible "by acclamation" (the ecclesiastical equivalent of the "previous question"), has been definitively abandoned. This has been reported for some weeks, but there now seems to be no doubt of it. The Council has then got down to the ordinary human means of having it declared through discussion; or, if it be irreverent to speak of the process as "human," of getting it divinely declared, after a certain amount of discussion. About the debates the Pope feels very much as Thaddeus Stevens used to feel about the debates over his Reconstruction bills; he *knows* he is right, but, in consideration of the weakness of the brethren, he lets them talk a little over his propositions. The inconveniences of this concession are, however, numerous. As soon as it was evident that the plan of an "afflatus" was given up, the opponents of the dogma began to seek each other out and organize—headed, as we said a fortnight ago, by Cardinal Schwartzberg and Bishop Dupanloup. A paper either protesting against or in some way indicating hostility to the dogma was then passed about. We have already mentioned the rumor—and we believed it—that Cardinal Schwartzberg had at the last moment refused to sign it, and then collapsed into obedience to the Pontifical will, and left Rome an object of pity to his friends and enemies. It is now alleged, however—as indeed it has been alleged by somebody of nearly everything anybody else has ever said about the Council from the beginning—that this is "a wicked lie," and that the Cardinal has signed the paper, and is still in Rome. The movement against the dogma has, however, as might have been expected, produced a counter movement in its favor, its supporters, who are far more numerous than its opponents, also signing a paper, begging for its submission to the Council. It is in its very nature something which it would be dangerous to pass over the heads of a recalcitrant minority. The latest talk is of a compromise in the shape of a declaration, in which the Pope's infallibility will be spoken of as a desirable thing, though not as an ascertained fact, but then this would appear to leave it still in the ranks of a "pious opinion" simply, where it would do the world little or no good. It is right to say that nearly

all the correspondents agree in accusing members of the Council and their ecclesiastical followers of telling falsehoods, both about what has happened and is going to happen concerning the Council, basing their charges on the frequency with which the fathers contradict each other. The ecclesiastics in their turn describe the newsmongers in terms which leave little room for doubt that they are emissaries of Satan. We have described elsewhere the consequences of the latest Papal decree, which the bishops consider a direct infringement of their prerogative, as it almost completely deprives them of their power of damnation, and, combined with the secrecy of the debates in the Council and the arbitrary restrictions on freedom of speech, has done much to foster discontent and division.

Two or three months ago, when a rumor was spread by one of our daily contemporaries that an alliance between Austria, France, and Russia, against Prussia, was on foot, we threw discredit on it. Everything which has since occurred goes to confirm our conclusions about it. The internal condition of Austria, which we gave as one of the reasons for refusing credence to the report, is still one of great confusion and perplexity, rendering all talk of an offensive foreign policy on her part almost ridiculous. She has had since then an insurrection in Dalmatia, which she suppressed with considerable difficulty; a ministerial crisis, not yet over; and the Czech question—that is, the question of the share the Bohemians and Galicians are to have in the government, which is alone serious enough to tear the empire to pieces—is still unsettled. Along with this comes up the question of reforming the Military Frontier along the Turkish border—a wide strip of territory occupied since the beginning of the sixteenth century by the Gränzer, soldier colonists, living in regiments governed by martial law, and supposed to be constantly ready to repulse the raids which for nearly two hundred years were the pastime of the Turkish beys. These Gränzer furnished regularly 60,000 men to the Austrian army. On a pinch, they could furnish 100,000. They were at the absolute disposition of the Crown, down to the last boy, and, since they ceased to be needed against the Turks, have been used in all the Imperial campaigns. The Military Frontier was, therefore, as might have been expected, one of the pet institutions of the old régime; but it was utterly incompatible with constitutional government, and kept a million of people in a state of barbarism, and it has to go down. Two of the regiments have been dissolved, the rest are soon to follow, and thus the last trace of the old relations of Turkey to Christendom will have disappeared.

It appears, however, that not only has Austria never thought of threatening Prussia, but Russia thinks of it just as little. About a month ago, the Emperor of Russia sent the King of Prussia the decoration of the military order of St. George, and the King in his turn sent the Emperor the Prussian order of Military Merit, and the Emperor took occasion in doing so to recall to the King remembrance of the grand days when their armies were fighting together for a "sacred cause;" and the Russian Minister at Berlin, in investing the King with the order of St. George, said it must be looked on as "a new pledge of the ties which bind together the two peoples and two armies." France was the enemy against which the two armies fought in the "sacred cause." This ostentatious revival of the memories of 1813 is looked on as intimation on the part of both sovereigns that the Fleury mission to St. Petersburg means nothing, and least of all a drawing together of France and Russia as against Prussia.

Salnave, after a checkered career, has been caught and shot, after the Dominican manner; but his army survives him, and, having joined Cabral, the foe of Baez, the combined force talks of attacking the Dominican territory, apparently disputing Baez's right to sell it to us, and being evidently likely to interfere with the proper taking of a popular vote on the annexation. If, as is not at all improbable, we have to make good our title by force of arms, it might be well to calculate beforehand what the island will stand us in, cost of subjugation included, and what the expense of police will be after we have subdued it. A fighting population, such as the Dominicans are, are not likely to be kept very quiet by sheriffs of their own choosing.

THE ST. DOMINGO BARGAIN.

WE hope sincerely the Senate will now act on the St. Thomas matter, and deliver the country from the somewhat discreditable position in which it stands with regard to the bargain made by the late Administration with Denmark for the purchase of that island. Whatever the hostility of the Republican majority to Messrs. Johnson and Seward may be, they would do well to consider the effect, both on our foreign relations and our domestic politics, of treating a change of Administration as a kind of break in the Government, over which no moral responsibility could be transmitted. Moreover, while it is acknowledged on all hands that we want St. Thomas as a naval station, and that it will answer all the purposes of a naval station, it has also the immense advantage of possessing a population in our own stage of civilization, and comparatively easy of assimilation, who may, in fact, be trusted to govern themselves and make a respectable and useful contribution to our public opinion.

The case of St. Domingo is different in many ways—so different that it is difficult, supposing St. Thomas to be ours already, to see what use it can be to us, except to supply custom-houses and post-offices to politicians. Were its population in any sense of the word a civilized population, or had we a civil service so officered and managed as to furnish a civilizing agency, we should have little to say against the acquisition. But we absolutely have no civil officers whom we can trust even to distribute Government charity amongst the Indians; for, this small and simple duty towards a handful of barbarians we have had to call for volunteers amongst the religious denominations. What the state of things will be when we take in hand the regeneration of the Dominican "Republic" may be guessed from a very cursory survey of the facts of the case.

The coast-line of the island, embracing the two republics of St. Domingo and Hayti, is about twelve hundred miles long, and, striking off, say, four hundred of these as Hayti's share, we have eight hundred left for St. Domingo. But in all these eight hundred we have been only able to discover one solitary custom-house. How many post-offices there are in the country it is impossible to say, as it is also to discover what the precise nature of the postal service is; but the probability is, judging from the general character of the inhabitants, that there is no great necessity for postal "facilities." The staple products of the country consist of gold, silver, iron, cattle, wood, tobacco, and hides. The area of the island is 22,000 square miles, and the population consists of 150,000 persons, of whom about one-tenth claim to be whites. What their color really is we have no means of knowing. The inhabitants have not, however, developed any great industrial capacity, their energies having been chiefly consumed, ever since the landing of Columbus in 1492, in perpetual wars. As a military community they have no equal on the surface of the globe, always excepting the inhabitants of the neighboring republic of Hayti, which is considered by some historians to surpass them. With such historians we are not inclined to agree. To go no further back than the present century, we find that in 1808 the "tyranny of Dessalines drove the Dominicans back" (from the kind protection of France) "into the arms of Spain." The next year they declared their independence, and for the succeeding thirteen years were in an "unsettled" state, till in 1822 the whole island was united under a republican form of government, and Boyer chosen President for life. Before the end of his life, however, Hayti, in 1844, cut adrift and became an independent negro state, after the celebrated battle of Santiago. After that Soulouque formed the habit of attacking St. Domingo every other year or so, and when he did not do it alone he did it in conjunction with a certain Jimenes, who appears to have been made a duke by Soulouque in consideration of his distinguished services. At length Buenaventura Baez, the gentleman who has just been negotiating with General Babcock, became "constitutional President," and immediately on his accession Soulouque began again. This cat-and-dog state of affairs has continued down to the present time; and the rôles of Usurper, Dictator, Invader, and Tyrant have always been readily filled upon the Dominican boards. The constitutional form of government as administered in St. Domingo affords great opportunities for this.

It is moulded upon our own, with a President elected for four years, five senators and fifteen representatives, a Supreme Court and various inferior courts. "Rotation in office" is with the Dominicans carried much further than with us, as, whenever an official is considered by a majority of the people to have held office for a long enough period, the latter rise *en masse*, slay him, and distribute "the spoils" among themselves. These risings, combined with the natural effect of the frequently recurring constitutional elections, make St. Domingo the office-seeker's paradise. Every Dominican expects some day or other to be President, and most of them succeed, unless they have the misfortune to be cut off in their prime by some one or other of their compatriots. It is difficult, indeed, to understand, in view of all these circumstances, why Baez should be so desirous of annexation. He has been President, off and on, for twenty years, and when he comes into the United States he only comes in as citizen of the least "civilized State in the Union. But it is said by a correspondent of the *Tribune* (and this may explain the difficulty) that Baez expects on the annexation of his country to be elected to represent her in the Senate of the United States. But if Gregorio Luperon and José Maria Cabral don't press him hard for that office, to say nothing of the chances of his throat being cut between now and his election, we are much mistaken. Luperon and Cabral have just united in a card to the American public, in which they conclusively show that Baez had no right to sell the island, because the constitution expressly forbids the cession of any territory to foreign powers.

This description of the condition of the island must show clearly enough what a splendid field will be thrown open by the purchase to all unemployed collectors, assessors, appraisers, postmasters, consuls, and district attorneys. The moment the treaty is ratified we shall witness an invasion of St. Domingo which will cast into the shade the worst filibustering of Soulouque. From every Northern State, from every Republican and Democratic headquarters throughout this broad land, we seem, with our prophetic eye, to see a stream of disappointed office-seekers pouring down upon the virgin soil of Dominica. Thither, with his carpet-bag in his hand, will go every would-be consul who has been denied a place by Fish, every would-be marshal spurned by Hoar, every Treasury clerk dismissed by Boutwell. Then will they acclimatize themselves, acquire rights of citizenship, and begin to speculate in real estate. Some will acquire an interest in the coal mines; others in the lumber districts; still others in the tobacco crops; not a few will start a hotel; not a few will organize "staunch journals;" while it may be that here and there will appear the prospectus of a railroad, a national bank, and a line of steamers from the ancient port of Santo Domingo to New York, or perhaps to Pekin. And then will come the second act in the drama. The curtain rises and discloses Washington. Here is that faithful friend of freedom, Jabez Tucker, sometime of Downville, Maine, now of Samana, S. D., U. S., who seeks at the hands of a generous Government the reward of his faithful service in the late war in the shape of a small Dominican post-office. And here is our old friend Silas Jones, born in Denver City, and late editor of the Kunkapot *Pioneer*, who asks for a small assessorship in the district of Santa Cruz del Seybo; and another applicant who comes for a steamship subsidy, and a thousand or two more who desire a consulship. But the thought which pleases us most is that of gentlemen who will apply for some of the internal revenue offices in the up-country. The interior of the country consists of mountain ranges, rising to an elevation of six thousand to eight thousand feet. What a place these tropical forests would be for the combination office of assessor and whiskey-distiller! There may the just man distil whiskey and assess his own tax till the end of time, transmitting the secret of his art to his children on his death-bed; and, if he goes out of office by rotation before that time, as he probably will, making an equitable arrangement with his successor whereby neither shall lose anything in the fair way of business. Clearly the internal revenue offices in the interior will be the best; but we should by no means recommend any one to refuse the positions on the coast. The custom-house of the port of St. Domingo, or of Samana, for instance; how pleasant a place for retirement after a long political life!

MODES OF PERSONAL REPRESENTATION.

WE are gratified at the interest in the subject of personal representation called out by our recent article upon that subject, and glad to have the objections which we made to the different schemes met by the friends of these schemes. The question is, at any rate, a difficult one; it is much easier to point out defects in a plan than to propose a better one, and we shall be abundantly satisfied if either Mr. Hare's plan, the New York plan, or Mr. Buckalew's plan receives a fair trial in the State of Illinois. We are glad to see that the Chicago *Republican* plan, which, as a correspondent well says, "would remove the sole remaining check upon the tyranny of the wire-pullers," appears to meet little favor in the Illinois Convention. Mr. Medill's proposition, which will probably be adopted, if any, embodies the leading principle of Mr. Buckalew's plan, by giving every elector a number of votes equal to that of the senators or representatives to be chosen by the same constituency, and allowing him to "cumulate" them. It very properly leaves it for the Legislature to determine the details in the practical application of the plan; and here we will say that its success will depend very much upon the skill with which this is done. If the State should be divided exclusively into "three-cornered" constituencies—as is very probable—it would still be hard for any candidates but regular nominees of the two great parties to be elected; the most efficient working of the plan demands that the election districts should be large enough to give wide scope to the individual choice. While we ourselves incline to regard Mr. Buckalew's plan as the best which has any chance of being adopted, we wish that the Convention were to have all three distinctly before it, and we should be glad—seeing that the whole thing is an experiment—if all of them could have a fair trial, each in a separate field.

In answer to "W.," we will remind him that we did not say that Mr. Hare's plan was too complicated, but that it is tacitly assumed to be so, and stands therefore no chance of adoption for the present. We agree with him that the work of the elector is as simple as possible, and that the clerical work, in which alone the real complication consists, would be done by hired experts, and need not be at all formidable. But a system, to be accepted, must not only be simple, but must be shown to be so to the average voter. And it is a fact that the average voter will not take the trouble to examine a scheme which certainly is complicated, for it requires lengthened explanation; and that until the voters understand it and urge it, it is idle to expect the politicians to take it up. We wish with all our heart that the Illinois Convention would try it among themselves as he suggests; but we must wait to see whether the Harvard Alumni will try it, as was proposed last summer. When they have tried it, and it works well, perhaps we can get politicians to look at it. Meanwhile, it is, as we said, tacitly set aside, on the ground—whether correctly or not—that it is too complicated for our community.

In regard to the New York plan, we are glad to learn from our correspondent that its application is intended to be confined to votes where the ayes and noes are called. Our former understanding was derived from the memorial of the Personal Representation Society to the Constitutional Convention of New York, which reads: "Each of the members would vote on all divisions according to the number of votes which he had received." It is true, the accompanying "report" says "upon every measure or act coming to a vote;" but we supposed that the formal "memorial," especially as it made use of italics, would contain the plan in its authentic form. But even now the plan is not free from objection. Its essential idea is, that it does not matter how many members there are in all, or of any given party; even a minority of members might efficiently represent a large majority of voters. That is very true, on the final votes. But on the preliminary votes the numerical majority of members, representing, perhaps, a minority of votes, would have it all their own way; so that, after all, on the New York plan we must choose between having this cumbersome method of voting applied to all divisions, and the chance that a minority of voters may have a majority of members to control legislative preliminaries.

But we are surprised that our correspondent should take exception to our identifying this plan with the theory of delegation. We had supposed that this was the peculiar merit claimed for it and possessed

by it; why else should one member of a legislative body have double the voting power of another, if not because he is supposed to reflect the wills and opinions of double the number of votes? It is no advantage to a man—and here is a frequent fallacy of the advocates of minority representation—to have a person in Congress whom he voted for, unless that person continues to hold the same views with him. The New York plan and Mr. Hare's plan both, it is true, propose to have every citizen equally represented, and thus the voting power precisely proportioned to the constituency; but it appears to us that a scheme which accomplishes this by cumulating the voting power in the hands of individual members in this proportion, may be fairly said to recognize the principle of delegation more distinctly than a plan which provides equal constituencies and then gives the representatives equal power. In the one case, every call of the ayes and noes forces attention to the fact that these men are the agents of such and such constituents, and are naturally expected to vote as those constituents desire; in the other case, there is no such preponderance of power possessed by one member or another as to lead to any exaggerated sense of dependence. By the theory of delegation we mean the theory that the representative is only the agent of his constituents, and is bound, whenever he knows their will, to act in conformity with it. Opposed to this view is that which considers the legislative body as trusted with discretionary powers, which it is bound to exercise for the public good, whether it may fall in with the wishes of any portion or proportion of the community or not. We held, in our former article, that the theory of delegation is correct when applied to issues which are distinctly before the community at the time of the election, but that for new issues it must fail. Now the New York plan would be perfect for the first class of issues; to the second it is unfitted, for the reason that it gives disproportionate powers to different members, based upon issues which now no longer exist. Of course, as our correspondent says, "under any system whatever, citizens must choose their representatives in view of the political situation as it presents itself to them at the time." But this, which is a difficulty under any system, will be aggravated by the one under discussion, for the very reason that it does provide so perfect a representation for the questions immediately at issue. To take an example: General Butler, who was chosen purely on the question of Reconstruction, probably misrepresents his constituents on the greenback question; but under the plan under discussion this misrepresentation would be enhanced in the ratio of the extra votes that were cast for him in a bitter personal canvass.

For the matter of that, as between this plan and Mr. Hare's, we do not hesitate to say that a more equitable and efficient representation will be attained by having the legislative body made up of men representing nearly the same number of voters and equal to each other in power, than in having the members vary in their voting power. It would be found, we feel sure, a better organized legislature for practical work. Both these plans lay more stress than Mr. Buckalew's upon absolute equality of representation, and in so far are superior to his; but, as we remarked above, this equality, after all, is of less importance than is often supposed; the present glaring inequalities in representation are among the smallest of the objections to the present system. Mr. Buckalew's plan has certainly the merit of simplicity, and will give good opportunity for an improved representation, while it avoids the difficulties of the New York plan. But all the plans proposed have objections on the score of expediency or fairness, and it may be that some plan will yet be devised superior to any of them.

But, after all, the most serious obstacle in the way of reform is not the inability or unwillingness of the community to understand a complicated scheme, but its inability to comprehend what is meant and intended by the reform. The public has become so habituated to our present methods, the majority is so accustomed to consider only itself, parties are so wedded to the belief that they are the nation, the district system is so universally accepted as a finality, that the first thing to be aimed at is that the community should understand the real meaning and aim of personal or minority representation. As our correspondent intimates, there is a great deal of misapprehension arising from this expression, "minority" representation—a misapprehension which lies

at the bottom of the Chicago *Republican* plan. There are two parties—just these and no more—and it is fancied that our end is reached when these two parties are proportionately represented. But it is not the minority, but *minorities*, that we wish represented. The only objection that we have seen telegraphed as being made to the principle in the Illinois Convention is, that it would enable the railroad interest, or what not, to combine and run in a member. Well, that is just what we want. What we desire is that every interest, every phase of opinion, every section should have its representative. Be sure any rich interest, like that of the railroads, will have enough representatives under any system; what we want is a system under which poor and scattered interests may do the same.

"THE NEW EDUCATION" AT YALE.

YALE COLLEGE has thus far shown, at least as regards its Academical Department, a strong determination to walk in the ancient ways, and, as far as its curriculum is concerned, to yield little if anything to what is called the "spirit of the age." Its Scientific School, however—to which President Eliot, of Harvard, in the remarkable series of papers on the "New Education" contributed by him in the *Atlantic Monthly* before his elevation to his present post, assigned the highest rank among institutions of its kind in this country—may be looked on as an attempt on the part of the University to compromise with the radical reformers. The foundation of it was laid by the gift of a building from Mr. Sheffield, of New Haven, in 1860, from whom, if we are not mistaken, it has also received an endowment in money. What with this and donations from other sources, including the Connecticut share of the Congressional land grant in aid of education, it is now in the enjoyment of an income of about \$25,000 a year. It has nine regular professors, nine other instructors, and about one hundred and forty students. But it needs at least three more professors, and those it has already need to be paid decent salaries; they have during the nine or ten years the college has been in existence been working literally for love. In other words, it needs an income of \$50,000 a year to enable it to do comfortably and efficiently the task which it has undertaken. Its difficulties have been aggravated, oddly enough, by the fact that its professors are men of unusual merit in their respective fields, and have consequently been exposed to solicitations from other colleges which the state of their funds made it exceedingly difficult to resist, and which nothing but a very strong *esprit de corps* and great enthusiasm for their work would have enabled them to resist. It was hardly to be expected, however, that serious breaches would not eventually be made in their ranks, if they were not armed against these temptations from the outside by the provision of adequate salaries by their own institution; and, accordingly, when President Eliot made a descent on the School last fall, and tried to carry off two of its leading members, Professors Whitney and Brush, although the immediate object of his attacks made a vigorous and successful defence, the attempt seriously alarmed the whole neighborhood, and made it plain to the Faculty that something would have to be done to prevent the recurrence of similar raids.

Accordingly, an active movement in aid of the funds of the institution has been set on foot within the last month, in which all the professors, but more particularly Messrs. Gilman and Brush, are taking a part. Forty or fifty thousand dollars were almost immediately raised in New Haven, and a meeting was held in this city last week at the house of a gentleman strongly interested in the institution, preparatory to a personal appeal to such of the solid men of New York as are interested in the higher education. It was addressed by Professors Gilman, Brush, and Lyman on behalf of the School—the first, however, doing most of the work of exposition and explanation.

He evidently addressed himself mainly to the friends of what is called "practical education," of whom his audience was in large part composed, and to them he was able to say, what nobody could deny, that the waste which goes on in this country every year in its mining, manufacturing, and agricultural industry, through the ignorance and incompetency of persons charged with the solution of the various scientific problems which all the arts present, was incalculable. Bad mining and mechanical engineers and assayers, for instance, cause immense waste of labor and capital in the mines; ignorance of the quality and constituents of soils and food, and inability to detect the frauds perpetrated in the manufacture of artificial manures, cause great loss of labor and capital among farmers; while ignorance of chemistry and mechanism works similar waste in nearly every branch of manufacture. What is worse is, that the large class who get

their living by cheating the industrious and saving portion of the community are able to command the services of a force of scientific quacks, who supply assays, analyses, and reports to order, and lure hundreds and thousands to their ruin by devices against which no amount of ordinary business experience or sagacity is a sufficient protection.

Now the scientific schools endeavor to supply men thoroughly trained to superintend the industrial operations of which this continent is the scene; and the Yale School is able to boast of having contributed a large number of the very best of them. Its graduates are almost immediately bought up for positions of great responsibility, and they have, almost without exception, filled them with extraordinary success. They are found all over the Union, in mines, mills, factories, and workshops, from Maine to California; and their course has been such as to give the diploma of the School a real value in dollars and cents, which business men have begun to recognize. This training, however, it must be said—and on this point Professor Gilman rightly laid great emphasis—derives more of its value from its moral than from its scientific ingredients. The students are taught, above all things, to be honest—to bear in mind that all pretence of knowing what they do not know, all hesitation in confessing ignorance where ignorance exists, is fatal to the scientific character, and converts the philosopher at one stroke into the humbug. To capitalists and investors—and their name is legion—who are suffering from the performances of pretenders and charlatans, this is, of course, a powerful recommendation in any institution which professes to train men for practical pursuits. We ought not to omit saying, too, that the School has made a beginning in the work of medical reform, by offering to young men who wish to qualify themselves for the honest practice of medicine a place where they may pursue those preliminary studies in botany and chemistry which are absolutely necessary to every doctor, but of which not one doctor in ten has even a tincture.

There was one point on which Professor Gilman touched slightly, if at all, at the meeting we have mentioned, owing, we are sure, rather to doubts of his audience than any want of appreciation of it on his own part, and that is the extent to which the new education, as he and his colleagues profess to impart it, is competent to do the work which the old professes to do. That portion of the community to which the higher education, whether it be scientific or classical, is valuable and important, will, we feel certain, never be fully satisfied with any training for young men which has no better claims to respect than its success in fitting them for "practical" pursuits. The test of any education to the community must eventually be, if it is not now, not the kind of engineers or chemists, but the kind of *men*, it produces. Of knowledge proper, the best of schools and universities can only supply a small amount; their main value to society depends, after all, on the kind of character they help to form, and the kind of quality they give to the mind. The great end of scientific training, as President Eliot said in his inaugural address, is to "develop and discipline those powers of mind by which science has been created and is daily nourished, the powers of observation, the inductive faculty, the sober imagination, the sincere and proportionate judgment." Greater things than this no education can do for any man. Less than this no education should set itself to do. If the new education does not do it, its effect on the profits of capital is a matter of small moment; no nation can live by profits any more than a man can live by bread alone. If it does do it, it cannot be proclaimed too loudly and too often, or dwelt on too strongly, as of all its doings the most important. Underneath the struggle for material good which is so marked a feature of American life, there is among all classes and conditions a strong and abiding dissatisfaction with it—a consciousness that there are things better worth striving for, pleasures which dividends cannot give and bad investments cannot take away; that even if our wildest dreams of material prosperity were realized, we should still be far from our ideal life. This noble discontent shows itself in many ways that seem impotent and mean. Swarms of quacks and pretenders in literature and science and art and politics live and grow fat by pretending to be able to satisfy it. It produces many of the oddities of the stump and reformatory convention, and finds vent in most of the impulsive outcries and wild schemes which are the terror and surprise of conservatives. But it furnishes to those who rightly appreciate the function of universities in this age, and in our society, their strongest incentive to exertion and their surest ground of hope. No college which means to do the work the times call for will ever overlook or underrate it, or place it anywhere but amongst the most prominent and most imperious of the wants it has to meet. Colleges, it must be remembered, however, are corps of instructors. It is the professors who make the

atmosphere in which the student has to live. All else is bricks and mortar and chairs and tables; and it is because we believe no institution in the country can boast a body of men more thoroughly imbued with the university spirit, the desire to live by truth and for truth, than the Yale Scientific School, that we think they can never go wrong in placing what they are doing for the American *man*, as something better than and distinct from the American engineer or chemist, foremost amongst their claims to the support and gratitude of the community.

DAMNATION DISTRIBUTED.

WE cannot imagine more cheerful reading for an orthodox Catholic than the recent Papal Bull of Excommunication, which, though dated October 12, has only just been published. In the preamble, his Holiness recites how, for good and sufficient reasons, numerous proclamations of *ipso facto* excommunication have been issued by the church from time to time, some of which have grown obsolete and useless in the changes of society and manners, giving rise to great anguish of conscience among the faithful. To relieve them from this unnecessary torture, he therefore proceeds to define now and for evermore the offences for which the afore-said *ipso facto* excommunication is positively incurred, assuring them that these and no others are subject to that dreadful penalty.

This is really a work of benevolence, when we consider that by the ancient canons, in force up to the 12th of October last, there were several hundred offences so heinous as to be properly punishable only by this last resort of spiritual power—a penalty which separates from the church militant on earth and the church triumphant in heaven, without trial, sentence, or appeal, the unlucky sinner who either knowingly or ignorantly incurs it. In reducing these hideous transgressions, therefore, to the comparatively trivial number of three dozen, Pius IX. has earned a new title to the gratitude of his flock—though it must be confessed that some of them are drawn up in terms so general that a single one embraces matter which the older custodians of heaven and hell divided into twenty or thirty.

Having thus resolved to be more liberal than his predecessors with the treasures of salvation entrusted to his charge, his Holiness proceeds to announce that all apostates and heretics, and all who refuse obedience to the Roman Pontiff, are excommunicated by the mere fact of their disobedience, and can only be reconciled by special application to himself. Geographers, we believe, estimate the population of the world at about a thousand millions, of which the Catholic Church boasts of possessing two hundred millions, including the Indians of Arizona and Paraguay. Thus, as the mouthpiece of Omnipotent mercy, Pius IX. at one word cuts off from all rational hope of salvation eight hundred millions of human beings, with their innumerable posterity, and it is no wonder that the official organ of his court declares this act of crowning mercy to be “une des plus belles pages du génèreux pontifical de Pie IX.”

Even this, however, does not exhaust the resources of his benignity, for he proceeds to include in the same curse all those who, without special authority from the Holy See, knowingly possess or read any books condemned by the Papal court. Thus, of the two hundred millions of faithful and obedient sons of the church, a very large proportion of the educated and cultivated are at once cut off. We tremble to think of the innumerable Catholic libraries which are condemning their possessors to eternal punishment by sinfully including on their shelves volumes which have been prohibited by the infallible judgment of the Congregation of the Index. Think of the Englishmen who have ignorantly indulged themselves by possessing Bacon's “*De Augmentis Scientiarum*,” Gibbon's “*Rome*,” Swift's “*Tale of a Tub*,” Robertson's “*Charles V.*,” Roscoe's “*Leo X.*,” or even Combe's “*Phrenology*”! Pity the Frenchman whose historical researches have led him to peep into De Thou's “*Historia Universalis*” or Sismondi's “*Républiques Italiennes*,” or whose literary tastes may have seduced him into the forbidden ground of Rabelais, or Montaigne's “*Essays*,” or La Fontaine's “*Contes et Nouvelles*,” or who, if scientifically disposed, has studied Raspail's “*Chimie Organique*”! One would have thought, indeed, that the perusal of Raynal's “*Indies*” or Vertot's “*Knights of Malta*” was in itself sufficient punishment, but the infallible judgment of Rome has decreed otherwise, and the weariness of reading those interminable books is but the foretaste of the endless torments in store for their luckless students, nor will the owner of Montesquieu's “*Esprit des Loix*” be allowed to plead ignorance to avert condemnation. So the Italian is hopelessly lost whose rash curiosity has tempted him to look into Botta's “*Storia d'Italia*,” or Giannone's “*Istoria Civile di Napoli*,” or Ginguene's “*Storia della Letteratura Italiana*,” or Dante's treatise “*De Monarchia*.” Not many Italians, we presume,

have incurred the penalty by wading through Rolli's translation of “*Paradise Lost*”—but as the condemnation of the translation doubtless includes the original, we tremble to think of the number of Englishmen and Americans who may now be expiating their indiscretion in eternal torment. It is to be hoped that the proportion of educated and accomplished Catholics is not very large, for we fear that this manifestation of Papal benignity may go hard with them.

Then the number of the saved is still further reduced by the condemnation of all who impede directly or indirectly the external or internal jurisdiction of the church. As Englishmen and Americans are lost by the previous clauses on heresy and disobedience and literary culture, this cannot do much harm to them, but as France and Italy and Austria have resolutely set bounds to the external jurisdiction of the church, and as the States of Central America have been somewhat recalcitrant on the same subject, we fear that some hundred or more additional millions are thus swept into perdition—especially as the succeeding clause specifically includes those who directly or indirectly subject ecclesiastics to secular tribunals—a crime of which all those states are guilty.

Then Spain and Mexico are likewise brought within the circle of condemnation by a clause which includes in the common curse all who invade or retain the revenues of the church or of her ministers, thus striking off at a blow some thirty millions more from the rapidly narrowing group of the elect.

All these being particularly heinous offences, Pius then proceeds to withdraw any powers which may have been previously conferred on any one to pardon them, and to include in the common excommunication any dignitary or prelate who may dare to grant absolution for them, except in *articulo mortis*—and then only with a reservation in case the dying man recovers.

Ireland we looked upon as a favored spot, exempt from this contagious perdition, until we came upon a special clause, apparently designed to bring the Green Isle under the ban. This includes all members of secret societies engaged in open or secret machinations against legitimate governments, as well as all who favor or give aid to such societies. Remembering Ribbonism and Fenianism, we felt that the doom of Ireland was sealed, and we grieved to think how few of the Patricks and Bridgets of America, who contributed their stamps to the “*Sunburst*,” could escape.

Having thus weeded out the faithful until few are left, except the clergy and the inhabitants of the Roman Territory, who are known to be enthusiastically attached to their paternal clerical government, his Holiness proceeds to decimate the scanty remnants of his flock by pronouncing the same terrible anathema against a number of less wide-spread offences, such as holding converse with excommunicants, farming out masses, simony, and a number of other peccadilloes, mostly of a clerical character.

As we said before, there must be something particularly cheerful to a devout and obedient son of the church in contemplating the care with which his spiritual father separates the black sheep from the white. Knowing that his faithful obedience secures him a place in heaven, he has the satisfaction of feeling that there is little danger of being crowded there so long as the vigilant custodian of the keys uses the power entrusted to him with an eye single to keeping out and not to letting in the countless millions of souls whose fate depends upon his will. On the other hand, as our comments are based on an official copy of the original document, no person who reads this need flatter himself with the hope that we have made a mistake, and that if he possesses any of the works we have mentioned, there is any excuse for him.

ENGLAND.

JANUARY 14, 1870.

MINISTERS have been unusually silent during the recess. They are conscious, I presume, that they have a heavy task before them, which will absorb the attention of the country in an unusual degree. For obvious reasons, they cannot talk about that, and they do not wish to incur any minor responsibilities. Moreover, we are at a period in which active agitation from outside is not specially desirable. The ministerial majority is quite sufficient to force a comprehensive measure through the House of Commons and to send it up to the Lords with an impetus which they would find it difficult to oppose. The problem is to secure a measure which will give tolerable satisfaction to the Irish, and which yet will not be too strong for the digestion of weak-minded Liberals. The ministry are of course applying their intellects to the excogitation of such a measure, and do not wish so delicate an operation to be disturbed by external clamor.

However, Mr. Bright has lately addressed his constituents at Birmingham in a speech which deserves notice in several ways. It does not, indeed, tend to clear up the question—What are we to expect? In a general way, he states that he adheres to his opinions, and that when the curtain is drawn, we shall be thoroughly satisfied with the spectacle. A minister could not well say more. It also appears that we are to have a decided measure upon education. For this we may thank mainly the new Education League, which is receiving great support and is fairly forcing the subject upon public notice. The battle between secular and denominational partisans is beginning to wax hot, and there is every chance of a very lively contest before the session is far advanced. So far, however, there is little news. I have more than once expressed my hope that these two questions would be in the foreground during the next Parliamentary campaign; and, to say the truth, it has been plain for some time past that that would be the case. But is anything more to be done? Upon this question, I am sorry to say that Mr. Bright took up a very doubtful position. He enlarged at great length upon the difficulties of the ministry; he said that it was impossible to "drive six omnibuses abreast through Temple Bar"—a fact of which Londoners are painfully aware both in the literal and the metaphorical sense. Indeed, I might say that the omnibus difficulty is owing in great part to the same cause as the legislative difficulty. Why does Temple Bar still obstruct locomotion in London? In America, I fancy you would have put it upon wheels and marched it down to some open space years ago, if you had not preferred the more radical remedy of simply levelling it with the ground. We do not move it, partly because we love everything old, even if it is ugly into the bargain, but even more because London has no single and vigorous municipal authority. It is a collection of parishes, governed by a whole wilderness of boards, whose various rights and duties are beyond the power of mortal man accurately to divide and describe. Consequently, when any improvement is seriously required—the embankment, for example, or the formation of a new street—we generally have to apply to the omnipotence of Parliament to come and cut the knot for us. Now Parliament, being choked with all kinds of more important interests, is very slow in coming to the rescue. And, consequently, old abuses are left standing which would be abolished at once by any vigorous local authority. This explains one great defect of our legislative machinery, which led Mr. Bright very fairly to describe it as a "clumsy instrument." It undertakes to be omniscient and omnipresent; to be about our paths and about our beds and to spy out all our ways. Nothing is too great or too little to occupy its attention. It talks about some big subject till it is bored, and meanwhile the members are exhausted by attending to what is called "private business" in committee meetings all the morning. They have absolutely no time to spare for the affairs of the nation whilst they are occupied in deciding about new railways and settling petty details about the rights of town corporations. Add to this the latitude which is very properly allowed to the minority of opposing measures by all kinds of motions meant merely for delay, and the freedom granted to individuals of talking indefinitely about any grievance which happens to strike them, and the wonder is rather that Parliament is not absolutely choked with the business which it undertakes than that it does not manage to transact more. However, a strong government can do a great deal; and if Mr. Gladstone chose to express his determination that almost any measure should pass, he might force it through in spite of any possible opposition. It is rather unsatisfactory, therefore, to find that Mr. Bright brings up these excuses as against the measure of abolishing university tests. There are few points upon which the Liberal party is so thoroughly united, and on which there is so little chance of compromise or useful opposition. If it is to be thrown overboard till a better time, there is little chance indeed of getting any wider measures through the troublesome defiles of Parliamentary discussion.

There is one other matter on which Mr. Bright spoke, which deserves a short notice. As you probably know, Mr. Odger, an artisan, is at the present moment contesting the borough of Southwark. It is a large constituency, and there, if anywhere, a workingman candidate ought to have a fair chance of success. Moreover, Mr. Odger is in some sense a pattern workingman. He is really the ablest of those who came forward during the reform agitation, and seems to possess altogether a more educated and generally cultivated intellect than is common in his class. Mr. Bright, however, spoke rather unfavorably of the principle. He said that the House of Commons required men who had really studied political questions, and were capable of forcibly expressing them. So long as they voted generally in favor of the sense of their constituents, they did all that could be wanted; and, as a general rule, class representation was a mistake, and calculated

to produce many evils. The members of the House of Commons still belonged to the same class as formerly, but their action has been most materially affected by the very different constituents behind them.

Without following out the argument, I will only say that it was rather a bold one for Mr. Bright, and appears to have given considerable dissatisfaction to workingmen. It suggests the remark, which is worth making on other accounts, that Mr. Bright, though known as a radical, is by no means a man of thoroughly democratic tendencies. On the contrary, his sympathies are, and always have been, very strongly with the middle classes. He is a man of genius, but not a man quite in sympathy with the advanced school of the time. He opposed the legislation for limiting the hours of employment in factories and insisting upon the education of children employed in them. He believes thoroughly in the *laissez-faire* doctrines, which, I take it, are radically opposed to the views of the more revolutionary school. And it is curious to observe that, popular as Mr. Bright is amongst a large party, his popularity among the artisans proper is by no means equal to that of Mr. Gladstone, who, though more imbued with certain antiquated prejudices, is also on many sides more susceptible to the influence of new ideas. I should not be surprised to see Mr. Bright earn a good deal of unpopularity by opposing certain democratic theories, after having won his place in public esteem by supporting others.

This at least is the view which many people will take of his action in this case. I must add that to me he seems to be substantially right. I do not believe that workingmen will do much, as things are at present—if they will ever do anything—by sending representatives of their own class to Parliament. It is curious to see that Mr. Odger is very generally supported by Conservatives. The reason, however, is very simple. In the first place, they are coquetting to a certain extent with the working-classes everywhere, and trying to make capital out of their prejudices against free-trade. The plan is not very deep-sighted or sagacious; for they may be pretty sure that their new allies would in the long run get the lion's share of the bargain. But there is such a tendency, and Mr. Odger so far falls in with it that, although a free-trader, he promises to ask for an enquiry into the working of the French Treaty. An enquiry, be it observed, is a way either of satisfying your constituents without injury to your principles, or, in some cases, of finding a pretext for evading your principles. I do not, of course, mean to deny that Mr. Odger is perfectly honest; but he is to a certain degree in a difficulty. Secondly, the Conservatives are far too sure of their power in the House to be in the least degree anxious as to the effect of admitting a workingman. It has a good appearance, and will not lead to any possible results. Mr. Odger will make a few speeches, and be very kindly received. If he is a man of real ability, he will, of course, do good service, as men of ability in other classes would do it. But he will certainly be in a very difficult position. On the one hand, he will be in danger of being put down as a simple demagogue, and of merely giving excuse for a little more ridicule against the political party to which he belongs. On the other, he will be petted and caressed by a number of interested people, both genuine Conservatives and professed friends of the workingman; and he will require a very independent spirit to resist their delicate addresses. But in any event, one workingman amongst 658 country gentlemen, merchants, railway owners, and prosperous lawyers will make little difference. The Reform Bill of 1867 has certainly made a change in the political atmosphere, though it is difficult to pronounce confidently on the final results. This, however, is plain enough, that, so far, it has not tended to diminish the power of wealth in the House. A long purse is as useful as ever towards getting into Parliament and attracting respect within its walls; and even if a few men in fustian coats should be mixed with an audience so little homogeneous, they would have little chance of really changing the spirit of its discussions.

I should, however, be glad to see Mr. Odger elected—not because I am very sanguine as to the effect he would produce, or believe that the workingmen would have made a specially good use of their power. But I should be glad to see that they do really possess power and are not afraid to use it; for we must, I suspect, look very much to their influence to force Parliament to set seriously about the much-needed task of social reforms. However, I am coming too near the borders of a discussion on democracy at large. I refrain from going further, and will end by stating that Prince Napoleon's little feat has just now put most other matters out of English as well as out of French heads. Unless the Duke of Cambridge shoots the editor of the *Times*, we shall hear of little else for the next few days.

Correspondence.

THE ALABAMA QUESTION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: All disputed questions must ultimately be settled by fact. No respectable person or nation would wish to have them settled otherwise. The British Government is accused of being over-hasty in recognizing the belligerency of the rebel States, in furnishing ships and opening ports to the belligerents to wage war on our commerce, by which means our commercial marine has become very much reduced. And many other ruinous effects growing out of the prolongation of the war are attributed to Great Britain.

With respect to the early recognition of the belligerency of the rebel States, it would have been much wiser in ourselves if we had perceived and acted on the real belligerent spirit of those States, earlier even than did the Government of Great Britain. That spirit had been manifested long before open hostilities commenced; but if when they had once broken out, we had resorted immediately to the use of such resources as were at our disposal for their suppression, among which were the colored militia of the nation, the war would probably have been shortened by two years, and its expenses lessened by at least one-half, if not more. By this means our sailors' and shipbuilders' wages would not have run so high, our commercial marine would not have been so much reduced, and our losses of ships would have been comparatively few; and above all, we should not now be paying some one hundred millions of dollars' tribute every year, by way of interest on our immense debt, to Western Europe.

The laboring millions of Great Britain and the Continent were as much interested to have cheap cotton as were ours; the poor men of both countries were, and still are, paying an enormous price for cotton, owing in a great measure to our failure to make a timely and vigorous use of our resources for the prosecution of the war; and the responsibility of this want of decision and vigor rests entirely with the war administration, and largely with the late Secretary of War.

If the prolongation of the war is due to a mistaken deference for the Democracy, out of fear that the nation might not be sustained in its struggles for existence unless the said Democracy should be conciliated to that degree that the principle for which we fought and the national life both should be endangered, then it is wrong either to attribute so much blame to Great Britain on the one hand, or such extraordinary laudation of individuals as the country has recently witnessed on the other. It behooves us, as a free, self-governing people, to see if the faults of which we complain did not originate with ourselves: if they did, it is revolting to true manhood, and exceedingly demoralizing to the community, to attempt to hide our eyes and those of the world from them by political demonstration and stunning eulogies over the dead. Nothing could more thoroughly or quickly demoralize a nation than an indiscriminate bestowal of office and honor, for imaginary political effect, upon unmistakable inefficiency.

The object of war is to make peace. The nation has furnished almost unlimited means in men and money for the purpose of securing peace, and yet, now nearly five years after hostilities have ceased, four of the ten original rebel States are still out of the Union, and under the rule of martial law, and still the country is resounding with praises for those who have left us in this condition!

No Christian nation has any excuse for prolonging war when it holds in its hands legitimate means, as we did, for its speedy termination, any more than it could have for carrying on war after its resources are so much exhausted that it resorts to inhuman means like those of prisoners for its continuance.

The futile yet constant efforts of our late Secretary of State, Mr. Seward, as unwise as they were persistent, to pacify our disturbance at home by oily diplomatic appliances abroad, has resulted in the transference of our unfinished domestic quarrel to the arbitration of England, which is to have the lion's share and control in the decision, while we, against the maxims of our traditional policy, are thus drawn into an entangling alliance, of uncertain issue, in which our national independence is sure to be abridged so long as it continues, and our debt remains unpaid.

J. W. PHELPS.

BRATTLEBORO, VERMONT, Dec. 29, 1869.

MILTON'S GREEK IMITATIONS AND IDIOMS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: It is much to be desired that the Congress of that "republic of letters" of which we hear so often, should pass a law forbidding all per-

sons to write about Milton, and especially to criticise his verbal expressions, without some knowledge of the ancient Greek language and literature. Some years ago, a magazine writer charged Milton with plagiarism because an obscure versifier had anticipated him in—imitating a passage from Theocritus. A discovery almost equal to that wonderful mare's nest of Theodore Tilton's, who impugned Miss Barrett's originality because her translation of an idyll of Theocritus resembled in some points Shelley's poem—which was an imitation of the same idyll. Theocritus, you will observe, is a frequent sufferer in these transactions, owing to the average American *littérateur's* utter ignorance of him; but we must do Mr. Tilton the justice to say that he corroborated his charge by showing that a certain line of Miss Barrett's resembled one of Poe's—written about a year later. But to return to Milton. A writer in *Appleton* has recently accused him of making a bull because he calls our first parents

"The loveliest pair
That ever since in love's embraces met."

Now this was not an involuntary Hibernicism on the poet's part, but a voluntary Hellenism. Milton uses it elsewhere, *e.g.*, he styles Adam "the goodliest man of men since born," and Eve "the fairest of her daughters." The idiom, as you are aware, is very common in Greek. An instance of it occurs in the very first sentence of Thucydides, who designates the Peloponnesian war as *the most important of those that had occurred previously*. The expression may be absurd *logically*, but so are many idioms in all languages.

CARL BENSON.

Notes.

LITERARY.

WE have received a printed circular from the "National Publishing Co.," of Cincinnati, informing us that they "*have in press, and will soon issue*," a "full and plain treatise, called 'The Medical Adviser,' by Rezin Thompson, M.D., Permanent Member of the National Medical Association," and "author of 'Thompson on Fever.'" The circular says, with a show of professional testimony, that some of the ablest members of the medical profession have examined it, and highly approve of it—in fact, allege that it is "the best" work of the kind ever published—and adds other praise of the publisher's own. It closes by promising that on receipt of a copy of the *Nation* "containing commendatory notice of the work," the publisher will send us, "at his expense, a copy of the work as soon as issued." In other words, he invites us to join him in practising a fraud on the public, by commending a book we have never seen, and which is not yet issued, and of which we know nothing except what the persons interested in selling it say about it. As it is hardly likely that this dodge was resorted to without the author's knowledge, we beg to call the attention of the "National Medical Association"—if there be such a body—to the performance, and should like to hear what provision the "Code of Ethics" makes for such cases. The public will understand that all "commendatory notices" of the book which they may see about this time are simply mendacious puffs.

—The first feeling with which we laid down the new *Woman's Journal*, published in Boston, was that, while differing wholly from the *Revolution* in those qualities which have made the latter discreditably notorious, and done so much to injure the cause it seeks to further, it resembled it in not rising much above platform discussion; and that consequently it brings no new method to the discussion of women's rights. Undoubtedly we should do wrong to generalize concerning a paper barely a month old, and we should be gratified beyond measure if the conductors of the enterprise succeed in winning contributions from the thoughtful, cultivated, and withal modest women whom the *Revolution* has thus far succeeded only in repelling and silencing. There are topics enough, after the right to vote is conceded, to engage the attention of women whether as actual or merely prospective citizens, and which it will be well to argue before the responsibilities which they court are laid upon them. True, so long as women have not actually gained the right they assert, the chief business of any organ of theirs will naturally be to combat opponents. But as the readers of a paper are not in general opposed to it in principle, this warfare has for them its limits of interest and profit. We should therefore like to see a department given over exclusively to instructing those already convinced on the main question, and containing something besides the constant assurance to women of their present fitness for citizenship. That a woman is as well qualified to cast a vote as an ignorant foreigner, is an argument so common as to be in danger of being unconsciously

adopted as a standard, with the evil effects of all low standards. The proper enquiry is, whether she can attain a fitness equal to that of the best men; and that every untried woman citizen may put to herself. The *Woman's Journal* has Mrs. Mary A. Livermore for managing editor, and Mrs. Howe, Mrs. Lucy Stone, Mr. Garrison, and Mr. Higginson for associates. Each editorial article has initials appended, but contributors may be as anonymous as they please. As to the editing, we may be allowed to say that we think it shows signs of the want of steady supervision from a single eye, and that it is a great mistake to make a paper, which is intended to influence the public opinion of the whole country on an important social question, even seem to be the organ of a body so fearfully and wonderfully speculative and local as the Boston "Radical Club." But, after all, we are, as we have said, only criticising the early numbers of a journal which is, after all deductions have been made, really the best effort yet made in a new and difficult field, and to which, though we are pretty sure to differ from it on a variety of points, we heartily wish success. The tone is excellent, and one paper—that of Colonel Higginson in No. 4—touches the kernel of the woman question. We trust his line will be followed up.

—The month just gone has made two or three contributions to the list of the distinguished dead of 1870. Salnave, the Haytian political chief, has just died what may be called the natural death of noted Spanish-American politicians, whether of mixed blood, or of white, or black, for he was shot the other day by a file of soldiers. It was a fate rather too hard for him, perhaps, he being a man of sense and good manners; but politics in Hayti consists in conspiring and shooting others, or conspiring and being shot; and Salnave had tried the former in his day, as well as the latter. In this country we have to chronicle the death of Mr. George D. Prentice, who not long since was perhaps the most influential, and was certainly the best known, of Southern journalists. Like a good many of the men who were serviceable, and who have become more or less famous, by working in literature for the Southern side of the slavery question, Mr. Prentice was a New Englander by birth; but going into Kentucky, as a young man not far past his majority, he soon became almost completely imbued with the Southern spirit. Up to the day of the breaking out of the rebellion, he might very well have been taken as a type of the regular semi-educated politico-literary Southerner who had no claims to be considered aristocratic in blood. He knew the Resolutions of '08 and English literature between Addison and Thomas Moore; he was always ready to take his chance under "the code" of his adopted State; he became a free liver after the extremely unpuritanical fashion of Kentucky; he could talk of chivalry as one to the manner born; and slavery had in him as willing a defender as if his father had been a planter, and he had not first seen the light on a Yankee "sidehill." Many are the stories told of the duels and the rough-and-ready fights in which he was engaged, as were most of the editors of that day and country; of the newspaper wars, peculiarly Southern in character, which preceded them; and of the orgies which accompanied them, and which were, indeed, part of the warp and woof of the life of the Southern and Border States a few decades ago. It is a characteristic anecdote that they tell of him and Mr. Reuben Darrett, once editor of the Louisville *Courier*, which was the local rival of Prentice's *Journal*. For several consecutive days in 1858, the *Courier* printed a paragraph—doubtless true enough—stating that Mr. Prentice, while "under a cloud," had fallen from the gangway plank of a steamboat, and been nearly drowned. "Probably," says our authority, "he felt that even his great command of language would not permit him to do justice to the subject;" so he announced that, in case the *Courier* should print the statement one time more, he should hold the editor responsible. Of course, Mr. Darrett gave his personal attention to the matter, and next morning the paragraph appeared in a conspicuous place. "Mr. Prentice," says our chronicler, "waited upon Mr. Darrett, and fired twice at him." His "brother of the quill," as the phrase used to go, was not behindhand in the use of firearms, and when satisfaction had been given, "each editor had a ball extracted from his hide." But, thoroughly as he seemed to have adopted Southern manners and opinions, there appears to have been something of New England left in him; for when the war broke out he took strong ground in favor of coercion. He hated an abolitionist; but his Whiggism, his dislike of Democratic secessionists, the sort of fetish-worship of the Constitution, and ardent love of the Union—the pride in America as the home of the eagle—which was so powerful a sentiment in the breasts of many men of the generation to which he belonged, kept Mr. Prentice, pro-slavery as he was, from going into rebellion. He was a fearless Unionist, and for a while in the beginning of the war he was very popular in the North, and got many subscribers in this part of the country,

who took the place of the many he lost in the South. But soon the war became what he called "a nigger war;" his sons went into the Confederate army; he was grown old and was sick, and his zeal for the Union as it was to be was a very different thing from his zeal for the Union as it was. Still, he did good service of its kind, and this should not be forgotten, although we find it impossible to think of him as a man of enlarged views, and although we know he was so far from being alive to the real issues before him that he never in the least comprehended them. He spent his best strength in the politics of Henry Clay's time, and was at one with Mr. Greeley in thinking that politician a man of vast ability and eminently worthy of the name of statesman. After the war was over, Mr. Prentice, of course, took sides with Mr. Johnson, and "even his great command of language" hardly sufficed to enable him to give expression to all the scurrility and bad temper and bad logic and forcible-feeble invective which he heaped on his antagonists. But, as we have said, he had grown old; his life had been in many ways exhausting; he was poor, and not his own master; his *Journal* had gone out of his hands and been swallowed by its old rival the *Courier*, and there is no saying for how much of what has been bad and weak in the *Courier-Journal* he is to be held responsible. Probably for little. Yet it is not denied that in his days of strength his paper was almost as noticeable for its malice and unscrupulous personalities as for its inexhaustible flood of cheap, coarse pleasantry. The editor always wrote as if the pistol was to make good what the pen said, and as if the community in which he lived would tolerate and applaud all brutality that had a pistol behind it. In this he was not mistaken. Even when he defended the notorious Matt. Ward for shooting a schoolmaster who had punished a younger Ward, it was easy for him by a little buffoonery to win over to his side the public opinion which at one time appeared to be setting against him. His ready wit, unscrupulously used, and his "appreciation of the value of short epigram paragraphs"—for circulation among an uneducated people, with a stock of prejudices which could do duty for ideas, and entirely unpractised in thinking—these qualities of his are those by which he made his mark on his own generation of his countrymen and those by which he will be remembered so long as he is remembered at all. Like many men of his stamp—men of quick feelings and no moral strength, who have lost many opportunities and thrown away much time and some power of mind, and who know and feel that they have done so—Mr. Prentice wrote some sentimental poetry, all of a pensive cast. None of it, however, caught the popular taste, for its author had little poetic capacity. A life of Henry Clay—published for partisan purposes—is Mr. Prentice's principal work, and it is now not known.

—It was in the last days of last year that the death occurred of "the Nestor of German Philology;" but the news was not received here till after the new year began, and the name of Wilhelm Wackernagel goes into the necrology of 1870. He died at Basle on the morning of December 21, in the seventieth year of his age. He had not made for himself a world-wide reputation, and many who knew of the renown of Jacob Grimm were ignorant that Wackernagel was, as a "Germanist," next in rank to that famous scholar. He was but twenty-one years old when he began to publish, and by the time he was twenty-seven he had secured a chair in the university at Basle, had published his work on the history of the German hexameter and pentameter since Klopstock, and was active as a politician, and ready for the municipal offices which he soon afterwards obtained. He was, indeed, a man of very active mind, always with many irons in the fire, as the titles of his works sufficiently show, and as would be more fully shown if to the titles of his elaborate works were added those of the innumerable articles which he wrote for magazines. He wrote elaborate treatises on philology, comparative mythology, the history of literature, the history of manners and customs, the history of art, the philosophy of art, and jurisprudence. He was an editor also, and a poet of no mean order, and his character, as well as his abilities and labors, will cause his death in the midst of his usefulness to be much and sincerely regretted.

—The importance of the wide-spread movement for getting German taught as of course in our common schools, makes it desirable to keep sight of its progress. At the West such a movement was natural, and so too in Pennsylvania. In New England, one would least have expected to meet with it. But it appears that in New Haven the German population is massed in a single district, and on their representations a German teacher was engaged for the Brown school. The private German-English school which he had till then superintended was given up, the pupils following him to the public school, and resuming there their instruction under him. The study of German for the rest of the scholars was made optional, but

the American children soon asked leave to join the class in which the language was taught, and did so without any urging from their parents. The examinations just passed showed a remarkable proficiency in grammar and in speaking, and it seems altogether likely that other New England cities will be led by this successful experiment to make similar provision in their schools for the study of German.

—In alluding again to the Seventeenth Annual Report of the Trustees of the Boston Public Library—the most valuable yet issued, and containing, besides statistics pertaining to the library itself, lists of the libraries in Massachusetts, in the rest of the United States and British America, and some of England and Continental Europe, with comparative tables—we wish to add a suggestion to one made by the Examining Committee, as follows:

"The Committee are inclined to think that it would be judicious to make the bulletins of new books, and the catalogues of the works of fiction, the vehicles of conveying some information regarding the relative value and interest of the different classes of novels, and of the position their authors occupy in the sliding scale of merit. This is a kind of knowledge which a great many of the applicants for books in the Lower Hall evidently need, and for which they would doubtless be thankful. As it is, they are often determined in their selection by mere accident; and whether they stumble on a work of tragic genius, or a bald recital of coarse horrors, the result is in either case due to chance or caprice."

The truth of this last remark will be generally conceded, nor could any one doubt the usefulness of an *index expurgatorius* such as is proposed. That, after all, is the proper name for an attempted discrimination between good and bad literature. In the present case it might lead to the enquiry why the bad was admitted to a library whose space is precious; but the answer to that is easy. Another mode of enlightening readers has been adopted by the new public library of Milan. The directors have arranged with public-spirited and learned men to make known in short lectures "the moral worth of the most important works of the human intellect," both new and old. On occasion of the first of these, an account was given of what was most notable in D'Adda's new version of Mignet's "Life of Franklin," and in one of Michelet's "Nos Fils." Of course not very much ground can be got over in speaking, even if the object were to present a classified summary of books of the day, or of works in certain branches of knowledge; but the instruction could be solid and lasting as far as it went, and the popular judgment educated in the best manner. We believe this sort of lecture to have in it greater capacity for good than all the lyceum talk we have had in the past fifteen years.

—There have been published during the last year in Great Britain and Ireland 4,164 volumes, of which number 1,319 were volumes that have been published before. That so large a proportion as nearly one-third of all the books published were books republished, speaks well for the sagacity of publishers, and may, perhaps, properly be taken as speaking to some extent in favor of the authors of our day, who of course supply the greater number of the reprints, although, too, there is just now a very intelligent interest in the good literature of earlier periods. As in previous years, theological and religious books make up a quarter of the publications of the year, numbering 1,047. Second come "juveniles," which reach the number of 500, the children being better—or worse—provided for each year. Fiction does not even come third in order, and the decay of the novel seems to be certain. Books classed under the head of educational and philological take the third place, there being 478 of them to 461 novels and romances. Fifth in the list is the class of books relating to the various fine arts. These number 341; and the believers in a millennium in the future rather than a millennium in the past will be glad to learn that works treating of political and social economy number 324, and are sixth in numerical importance. Poetry shows well with 274 volumes, and perhaps we may plead in its behalf what we no doubt must take into consideration in the case of novels, that each book gets many readers; but the ratio of readers to owners or purchasers is doubtless greater in the case of novels than of any other class of books.

—Forty-one hundred, more or less, being the number of books published in Great Britain during 1869, it is a little surprising to be told that Germany published 12,000, or nearly three times as many; that France published about 9,000, or more than twice as many; and that America published only some 2,000. But nothing lies like figures, if we put into their mouths our inferences; and anybody would make a mistake who should argue from these statistics that there is twice as much reading and writing in France as in England, and that there is twice as much reading and writing in England as there is in the United States. Other considerations must be taken into account. The surveillance of the police in

France is strict; and then, too, the French talent for systematizing is like other talents, and works its proper evil as well as its proper good. Publications are well registered in France; but the registry includes every trivial broadside and pamphlet. In Germany, also, there is a formal registration of insignificant performances which in England would escape official notice. And in America we are not only so notoriously lax, and free, and easy-going in our management of such matters that our formal records of works published give no accurate indication of the amount of reading and writing done, but also an immense deal of our reading and writing we do as a nation of newspaper makers and newspaper consumers. Most Americans, we may say, do not read books and do read newspapers. It is to be noted, however, that the number of American works reprinted in England in 1869 is about one-fifth of the total number which we produced in that year. They reprinted four hundred, lacking three, of our books. So anybody who has been "kept awake nights" by that impudent question of the unprophetic Canon of Saint Paul's may now sleep in peace. We, for our part, please ourselves with the thought that the day is coming when the name of Sydney Smith shall be far better known as that of the man who actually made that singular enquiry, than as that of the most jovial of English wits and one of the very cleverest of English unprofessional authors.

—The *Pall Mall Gazette* lately gave some account of a little work on "The Theory and Practice of Creole Grammar," by J. J. Thomas (Port of Spain, Trinidad, 1869), and we have found it interesting to compare some of the examples cited with corresponding Creole idioms in Louisiana and Hayti—where, as well as in Trinidad, the French patois has been exposed to Spanish influence. The Creole of Trinidad, with the African repugnance to the sound of *r*, makes *w* of it, as in *bouare* (brave); or changes it into *l*, as in *callefoù* (carrefour); or drops it, as in the last instance, and in *paier* (parler), etc. In like manner, our Southern negroes generally say *mo'* for more, *do'* for door—

("O Deat', he is a little man,
And he goes from *do'* to *do'*")—

and shorten brother into *bro'*; while the Louisiana creole says *pou* (pour) *naig* (nègre)—

("Li fait *naig* payé *pou* sauté lupé")—

maite (maître), etc. The Haytian, too, when asked how he is, replies—"as master pleases": "*à la volonté maite*;" and uses *conte* (contre), *frê* (frère), *agent* (argent); Louis. *arzan*, *jounée* (journée), *joudi* (aujourd'hui), etc. "*Ba nou joudi la nouriture*"—"Give us this day our [daily] bread," is his prayer; and the form for give is matched in Trinidad; "*Bâ* (baille, Old French) *moèn boèr*"—"Give me to drink [spoken to the woman of Samaria]." In the latter island the indefinite article is *yon* (un); in Louisiana this article is much neglected, but we have *aine* (un, one), and *inpé* (un peu). In Trinidad, the definite article follows the noun, and is *la* (là) for all genders: *mam'selle la*, *chouval la*. We find a kindred form for horse in Louisiana, in a song describing a plantation ball in the stables:

"Dans lequie la yavé gran gala,
Mo cré chouval la yé té bien étouné"

Here, too, the article follows, but it may also precede. Both modes possibly occur in these lines:

"*Mo pancer onar* [Je n'ai pas encore vu] griffonne la
Qua mo gout comme la belle Layotte"

La is likewise used for both genders, and so is *li*. In Trinidad, *matante* is simply aunt, *lapôte* (porte) simply door, *nômme* (yon ômmme) simply man. From Louisiana we have already quoted *inpé*, *pancor*, *lequirie* (l'écurie); and may add *ya*, *yavé* (il y a, il y avait), as amalgamated words. Pronouns may be thus contrasted:

Tr. <i>mocu</i> (je),	L. <i>mo</i> (je, me, mon), H. <i>mon</i> , <i>m'</i> (je), <i>I</i> ;	
	<i>mouin</i> (moi),	
<i>ous</i> (tu, vous),	<i>té</i> (tu, toi?),	<i>thou</i> ;
<i>li</i> (il, elle),	<i>li</i> (il, elle, lui),	<i>he, she</i> ;
<i>nous</i> (nous),		<i>nou</i> (nous), <i>we</i> ;
<i>zôtes</i> (vous autres),	<i>vous</i> (vous),	<i>ou</i> (vous), <i>you</i> ;
<i>ycaux</i> (ils, elles, eux),	<i>yé</i> (ils, elles, leur),	<i>yo</i> (eux), <i>they</i> .

The Trinidad infinitive ends generally in *er*, but after a nasal letter, in *en*; and it plays the principal part in conjugation, as *moèn aimèn*, I love, *ous aimèn*, thou lovest, etc. So, in Louisiana,

"*Michié* (Monsieur) *Préval li donnén gran bal*,"

on which occasion

"*So cocher Louis té maite cérémonie*."

Té (était). And in Trinidad: *moèn té aimèn*, I was loving. Here the continued present is *moèn ea manger*, I am eating, *ea* being probably for the form "*va*." The Haytians have a different corruption: *m' a pé fait*, I am doing; *m' t'a pé fait*, I was doing; *m' té fait*, I did—*t'* and *té* being, of course, "était," or "été," and *fait* the infinitive, throughout. The follow-

ing line in Louisiana Creole combines examples of article, pronoun, conjugation, and order :

"Cadeau la li té promi monin."

That is to say: "Gift the to her had promised I."

MR. LEA'S "STUDIES IN CHURCH HISTORY.*"

THE themes which Mr. Lea handles are not of a popular cast; they relate mostly to obscure parts of mediæval history. Yet his book, strange to say, is timely, being rendered so by the Latin Council and the widespread interest kindled by it in the dogmas and polity and policy of the Roman Catholic Church. The volume is made up of somewhat fragmentary but well-considered and learned essays on a variety of special topics, which, however, are grouped together under the general titles: "The Rise of the Imperial Power," "Benefit of Clergy," "Excommunication." As in the case of his former works, Mr. Lea has prosecuted his researches, in a truly scholarly spirit, among the documentary sources of church history, and he has thereby given a character of freshness and thoroughness to his discussions. But, as heretofore, he has purposely omitted to examine to any great extent the productions of other laborers in the same field. This course is attended with obvious disadvantages. The true method is that adopted by the Germans, of combining personal investigation of the sources of knowledge with careful attention to the other writers in the same province. The plain principle is that a party of explorers can bring to light more than any one individual. Hasty generalizations, as well as incorrect observations, are rectified, and imperfect studies are filled out by the concurrent exertions of many minds. At the same time, when there is so little thorough work in historical study done, we are little inclined to make a too exclusive reliance on isolated researches a ground of complaint. We are more disposed to be instructed by our author than to criticise him.

Mr. Lea adopts for the motto of his work the well-known lines of Dante in the "Inferno" (xix.):

"Ah! Costantin, di quanto mal fu matre,
Non la tua conversion, ma quella dote,
Che da te prese il primo ricco patre!"—

which are thus rendered by Cary:

"Ah Constantine! to how much ill gave birth,
Not thy conversion, but that piteous dower
Which the first wealthy father gain'd from thee."

As Mr. Lea dwells on the numerous forgeries of which the pretended gift of Constantine to Pope Sylvester was one of the most conspicuous, it is not quite clear with what intent he has placed these lines on his title-page. However, Dante himself elsewhere implies a doubt of the reality of the famous donation; and Mr. Lea's idea probably is to give prominence to the fact that the fictitious story of the gift, and especially the temporal power for the furtherance of which the story was invented, have been prolific of disasters. It is the text for the dissertations that follow.

As we are adverting to this subject, we may notice a statement of the author on a controverted point of much interest. When Pepin made the gift to the Pope which laid the foundation of the temporal kingdom, and when the Pope became Patricius of the Exarchate, while Pepin was made through the act of the Pope, representing the Roman people, Patricius of Rome, what was the real import of this transaction? "Two Italian expeditions," writes Mr. Lea, "brought Aistulph the Lombard to reason, restored to the Holy See—or rather to the Roman Republic—the territory of which it had been despoiled," etc. If we understand him aright, he agrees with Savigny that the Pope and Pepin had in mind the restored Western Empire, as an unrealized idea; and that to this empire—then, as it were, in a state of suspended animation—sovereignty was reserved or subordination acknowledged. This is probably the true view. Gieseler, one of the most accurate of historians, affirms that in the act of both the parties in that memorable transaction, there was a tacit recognition still of the supremacy of the Eastern Empire. This must be considered, to say the least, doubtful. The coronation of Charlemagne in the Basilica of St. Peter sealed and proclaimed the consummated revival of the Empire of the West.

Mr. Lea observes in the preface that in depicting the crimes and abuses of the Church, he is actuated by no want of appreciation of its merits and its services to civilization. But, he adds, "in summing up the benefits which man has derived through the church, we may also not unreasonably enquire how much greater would have been our advance in all that renders us worthy of the precepts of the Gospel had that church always

been true to its momentous trust." No one can reasonably object to the author's line of discussion, although this explanation is a proper one to give. The Papacy in the Middle Ages conferred vast benefits on European society—indispensable benefits—which could have been obtained, as far as we can judge, in the condition of things that existed then, in no other way. It is enough for the Protestant to claim that mankind have outgrown the Papacy, and that the day when the paternal oversight and spiritual domination of the Roman bishop brought more good than evil to the nations of the European family, is past. It seems remarkable, we may add, that if Janus, the "Great Unknown," be really a Roman Catholic, he should wholly omit to set forth, even to save himself from misunderstanding, the unquestionable good that flowed from the Papacy, sometimes when the office was held by unworthy men. If the author of "The Pope and the Council" be a Roman Catholic, he is a "liberal" one indeed.

There are many subjects considered in this collection of essays by Mr. Lea which invite comment and, in some cases, challenge criticism; but we recommend the book, without further remark, as a highly instructive discussion of matters which are always of interest to scholars, and which are just now clothed with a special importance.

HAYDN'S DICTIONARY OF DATES.*

THIS work has been in the hands of the public for twenty-eight years, passing through twelve English and a number of American editions. It is needless now to expatiate on its general usefulness. Planned on a comprehensive scale, but very poorly executed by its author, it has been gradually improved in its later editions by the correcting and completing hand of Mr. Vincent, who, in 1855, undertook its revision and continuation, "in order to render the book more worthy of its established reputation."

Unfortunately, however, the defects of the original publication, to be radically removed, required much more than the amount of labor and care which even conscientious revisers are inclined to bestow upon the work of others. And so the "Dictionary" remains highly imperfect, in spite of continued completing and correcting, and many articles will still have to be "rewritten, and new ones inserted, and much geographical, biographical, literary, and scientific information supplied," and numberless inaccuracies in dates and names eliminated, before it becomes, what it is intended to be made, "a digested summary of every department of human history brought down to the very eve of publication." To make it worse, Mr. Vincent's own additions are not always made and revised with the necessary care. Thus, for instance, in the "Table of Contemporary European Sovereigns," which he has placed at the head of the last (twelfth) English edition, we find a number of errors and omissions. The accession of Christina of Sweden is dated "1633," instead of 1632; that of Charles II. of England, "1650," instead of 1660; that of Czar Nicholas "1828," instead of 1825; that of King William of Prussia "1860," instead of 1861. Napoleon's second reign, in 1815, is forgotten. Ferdinand I. of Hungary (1526) and Ferdinand I. of Austria (1835) are both entered as Ferdinand II. The Empress Maria Theresa is to be found neither under "Germany," nor under "Hungary," nor under "Austria," being crowded out by her husband, Francis I., though he was only German Emperor, and never reigned in his wife's hereditary dominions.

The American edition before us is based upon the last English (of 1866). It professes to have brought down "this Dictionary of Dates," which is at the same time a *chronicle* and a *chronology* of the world's progress . . . to the present year; even to the time when "the work has been passing through the press." This is, however, far from being an entirely correct statement, as a mere glance over the tables and chronologies will show. The "Population and Governments of the World," at the very opening of the book, are given "according to the Almanach de Gotha for 1866," though at least three later editions of the "Almanach," containing considerably modified tables, were at the American publishers' disposal. The history of the "United States" ends with "Dec. 29, 1865," where Mr. Vincent left it; and the trial of Andrew Johnson, for instance, is as little mentioned in it as the opening of the Pacific Railroad; the list of "Presidents," etc., alone receiving an additional line. The latest date in Russian chronology is "Sept. 13, 1865," such events as the two attempts at the life of Czar Alexander II., or the conquest of Samarkand, being ignored. The latest under "Cuba" is a Spanish ministerial declaration of

* "Haydn's Dictionary of Dates, relating to all Ages and Nations, for universal reference. Edited by Benjamin Vincent, Assistant Secretary and Keeper of the Library of the Royal Institution of Great Britain; and revised for the use of American readers." New York: Harper and Brothers. 1869.

* "Studies in Church History. By Henry C. Lea." Philadelphia: Henry C. Lea. 1869.

"Dec. 19, 1854," in reference to the Ostend manifesto of "Messrs. Buchanan, Mason, and Soule." Nor is there an allusion to anything more recent concerning that island in the brief addition to the chronology of "Spain" about the "revolution in Madrid (*sic*), headed by Prim, Serrano, and Topete," which is one of the few and entirely exceptional insertions on which the American editor bases his pretence of having brought down the work to the date of publication. The assertion that "the events of the Revolution, of the war of 1812, of the Mexican and of the Indian wars, were incorporated into the work by Mr. Benson J. Lossing," seems to rest on a similarly slender foundation; for parts of the chronology of those wars are disfigured by inaccuracies of which that writer would hardly have made himself guilty.

No portion of the work, however, is more poorly done than the events of the Civil War, of which the American editor assures us that they were compiled "by a separate editor, who had made those events the study of several years," and "carefully arranged and revised." According to article "Battles" (sub-title, "American Civil War"), Fort Sumter was captured "April 14, 1861," not April 13, as correctly stated under "United States." The same article makes the battle of Wilson's Creek a "Confederate defeat," though, under the special head, we read that of the Union commanders Lyon was killed, Sigel was routed, and Sturgis retreated. Under "United States" we read of "severe conflicts at South Mountain Gap, Sept. 14-16," but the special notice on "South Mountain" justly knows only of fighting on "Sept. 14, 1862, three days before the drawn battle at Antietam." The latter is designated "a drawn battle" also under its own head, but under "Battles" we read: "Antietam . . . Lee defeated by McClellan." "Antietam Creek" contains the correct statements that "on the 16th Lee was joined by Jackson," and that "on the night of the 18th he recrossed the Potomac," but according to "United States" both these events took place "Sept. 17." None of the three articles has an allusion to the opening of the conflict on the 16th. The second battle of Bull Run and the second battle of Corinth (Oct. 1862) are also entered under "Battles" as one day's conflicts. According to the last-named article, the battle of Stone River or Murfreesborough began Dec. 31, 1862, and ended Jan. 3, 1863, but according to "United States" it began on the 29th, and Bragg retreated on the 2d—neither of which statements is correct. "Chancellorsville" correctly speaks of "conflicts on May 2, 3, and 4," but the corresponding date under "Battles" is "May 1-4." The latter article calls the battle of Chancellorsville "indecisive," but declares Lee "defeated" at Gettysburg; "United States" declares Hooker "defeated" at Chancellorsville, and Gettysburg "indecisive." "Battles" adds the 4th of July to the three days of the last-named struggle. According to "United States," "Grant defeats Bragg at Chattanooga Nov. 23-24," while "Chattanooga" and "Battles" more correctly mention the 24th and 25th. "Battles" prolongs Longstreet's siege of Knoxville to so late a date as "Dec. 4, 1863," while "United States" justly makes him retreat on the 1st. According to the latter article, "Lee [and not Early] invades Maryland, . . . defeats Wallace, . . . threatens Baltimore and Washington, and retreats" in July, 1864. The battle of Five Forks is, under "Battles," twice given, once in its place, and once out of it. This list of blunders is far from embracing all we have discovered in the "special editor's" work.

THE MAGAZINES FOR FEBRUARY.

THE *Atlantic* for this month is better worth reading for its book notices than for anything else in it, though more than one of the articles in the body of the magazine are good. For instance, of all that has been written about the California Chinese, there is little that is so instructive and readable as Mr. Sidney Andrews's "Wo Lee, and his Kinsfolk;" and the sketch of the strange life in the Isles of Shoals is, like its predecessors, admirable in many respects. In fact, all things considered, there is not, we should say, any other American female writer who gives at once so much satisfaction, and so little dissatisfaction, as Mrs. Thaxter. Better than negative praise can be given her, for she is always interesting in her matter, and in manner she is superior to most. Perhaps the honesty and the absence of all pretension—barring a controlled tendency to word-painting—which the reader notes in her writing prejudices him in her favor, but it will be found that what she does bears examination. The reviews, however, are remarkably good—especially those of Jarves's "Art Thoughts," "The Holy Grail," Thackeray's "Miscellanies," and Konewka's "Midsummer-Night's Dream." The notice of Mr. Jarves's book is even a thing to be thankful for. Most of the art criticism helps nobody, being either so much mere brutal expression of the writer's feeling at

sight of such and such a painting—or such and such a painter's painting—or else being so much mere technical talk, which may or may not be of service to the artist or artisan, but for which the world outside the studios cares nothing, and need care nothing. This writer in the *Atlantic* seems to be better fitted than almost any other critic in this country to stand as an interpreter between the public and the men who try to talk to it with brush and chisel; and it is to be hoped that he may be regularly heard from. Indeed, it is to be wished, in general, that the critical department of the *Atlantic* should have more space allowed it, for it is seldom that it is not the most profitable part of the magazine.

Mr. Parton, in his account of the "Pressure upon Congress," is more tolerable and more to be endured than is usual with him; Mr. Shanly's "Street Cries of New York" is padding certainly, but of a good quality; the same thing might be said of "The Value of Accident," if the subject had not such possibilities of vastness and mystery that any easy treatment of it seems impertinence; Mr. Wilson's "Edwin M. Stanton" has interest, if not merit; and "Life in the Brick Moon" and "Father Mériel's Bell" are fairly good magazine stories. The former is at an end, we believe. Mr. Taylor's "Joseph and his Friends" seems to us neither better nor worse than his other novels, none of which, we admit, do we know too well, for none of them have we found readable. The very carefulness with which they are done offends, abstractly praiseworthy as no doubt it is.

Of the *Atlantic's* verses, those by the best known author are those entitled "Rhyme Slayeth Shame," by Mr. William Morris; but the best are those entitled "Risk," which are by an anonymous author, who need not fear to put her name to her works. The Brownings, both of them, had a hand in giving form to the poem, but, evidently, the poem existed independently of them. "Rhyme Slayeth Shame" is a poem of a sort which it is permitted to our favorite poets to make, but which Mr. Morris would do best for himself, we should think, to indulge in sparingly. "The Way to Sing," by H. H., nobody will quarrel with.

The portion of Charles Reade's story that we get in this month's *Galaxy* is better as evidence that the best novels cannot be written for monthly magazines than it is as anything else. It would be hard to find a more manifest case of the dyer's hand subdued to what it works in than this descent of talent almost, if not quite, amounting to genius into the region where clap-trap is generally tyrant and always is almost supreme. But though admirers of Mr. Reade will feel regret that the writer of "Peg Woffington" should transform an architect into a stage-carpenter, they will not deny that "Put Yourself in his Place" is a story that commands attention and gives great pleasure. Rose Terry contributes a sketch of a New England tailoress, which is pleasanter by much than most of the New Englandism that gets into contemporary literature. It is straightforward portraiture, and the portrait given is that of an individual. Usually, the Yankee of the books is a patronized creature, put on the canvas for the purpose of showing how inferior the typical Puritan was to his "cultured" descendant. He, therefore, is generally offensive, as being a revelation of pretentious weakness. But for any one who chooses to look at the men and women who surround him in a Yankee community and who has skill to say what he sees, New England is as full of material useful to the portrayer of "characters" and character as ever Scotland was; and how prolific Scotland is in picturesque humanity everybody knows. The Scotch believe in their ancestors, though; and Lowell Institutes, and exhibitions of pictures, and organs of great size might be established in every town of North Britain without setting Scotch writers to patting their forebears on the back and stating that of course they were badly off as regards aesthetics, but still they were estimable people for persons who were ignorant of Williams and Everett. One of Miss Terry's personages, let us not forget to say, remarks that "it takes all kinds of people to make a world, and she's glad she ain't one of 'em."

We continue to praise the "Current French Literature" and "Current German Literature" departments of the *Galaxy* as containing information of value pleasantly conveyed. Good, too, is the "Drift-wood"—the article on "Byron as Man and Poet" being noticeably clever as an exhibition of "journalistic talent," and as criticism, also, it is sound. To say anything new about the Byron controversy was not an easy thing, but "Philip Quilibet" has contrived to do it acceptably. Has anybody yet noticed, by the way, what a strong family likeness there is between Byron and all of the heroes of Mrs. Stowe's novels? Aaron Burr, as he is conceived of in "The Minister's Wooing;" Ellery Davenport, in "Old Town Folk;" Saint Clair, in "Uncle Tom's Cabin," are all Byrons, more or less embryonic, to be sure, but still Byronic in essence. This is something not merely curious, but really worth consideration by any one who

cares to discuss exhaustively the remarkable chapter in literary history which Mrs. Stowe has offered us for perusal.

The other miscellaneous departments of the *Galaxy* will not be much praised. But as yet the series of articles on "Things of To-Day" is only in its beginning, and the probability is that it will gain in freshness and value, "Carl Benson" generally having something to say—more, a good deal, than almost any other writer of equal readiness to speak. Nobody, however, would call these four articles good ones. For the rest of its contents, the *Galaxy* has another of Mr. Anthony Trollope's wooden "Editor's Tales;" some sensible talk by Mr. Justin McCarthy on Salt Lake City and Brigham Young—which, however, has the irritating "spirit-of-fairness" tone that most of Mr. McCarthy's writing has; the first chapters of a clever story—as we suppose it to be—called "Letters from Havana;" a love story, perhaps by Mrs. Jane Austin, with the title of "The Over-soul of Manse Roseburgh;" and half-a-dozen other pieces in prose and verse. Mrs. S. M. B. Piatt, Mr. Henry Abbey, and Miss M. J. Preston are among the poets—Miss Preston showing to great advantage beside the others.

The opening article in *Hours at Home* is some readable abuse of Sunday-school libraries, written by the Rev. George B. Bacon, who expresses, in his customary lively way, his opinion of the literature which the Sunday-schools give to the children. But the question which he discusses is really involved in another larger one. The libraries in the Sunday-schools are, like the schools themselves, means of inculcating certain dogmas, and as the results produced by schools are good or bad, so are the results which follow upon the reading of the libraries. The distinctively literary influences of the Sunday-school books it can hardly be worth while to estimate. At the last, is it not that we must make our choice not between Sunday-schools with good libraries and Sunday-schools with bad libraries, but between Sunday-schools and no Sunday-schools? Certainly, it would seem to be so in this country; for, whatever Sunday-schools may have been when they were first established, and whatever it is that they ought to be, the fact is that in the United States the Sunday-school is the servitor of the converting church, and is thought to do best when it makes children church members. It is among the Unitarians, then, who may be described as Christians without dogmas, and with little of positive Christianity to teach, that we might reasonably expect to find Sunday-school books which secular readers would admit to be good, and that this expectation is answered by the fact, Mr. Bacon plainly says. He gives high praise to the "Ladies' Commission" of the Boston Unitarians, which has selected the libraries used by most of the schools of their denomination. That these ladies deserve at least some praise may be guessed from the fact which he states, that the six hundred titles which appear in their first catalogue represent all that were approved out of nineteen hundred books offered for acceptance.

Other papers in *Hours at Home* that will be found interesting are Professor Burt Wilder's "Something on Bats;" Dr. Gillette's "Yale," and Professor Porter's discourse on novel-reading. The attack on novels as mere collections of delusive lies was so loud and persistent, and so easily well answered, that the main objection to the habit of reading them gets little attention from anybody nowadays. But, undoubtedly, no novels have been written the reading of which was not, to anybody except writers of novels, mental relaxation, and novels are temptations to play, and consequently, as means of unfitting people for hard work, they no doubt deserve a good deal of the hostility that has been expended upon them.

Harper's has for the most important or most interesting article in its table of contents, Lord Lytton's rhymed comedy of "Walpole." It is as readable for once, and as little readable for more than once, as all of its author's later writings. His earlier and worse works one can read over with willingness and a sort of pleasure, for, at least, they help one to reproduce certain states of youthful opinion and feeling; but the books which resulted from our author's throwing himself on his brains and reading, bear one perusal a great deal better than two. The first books had feeling in them, if nothing else, but the later ones are no more than other books saturated with Bulwer to a greater or less degree, and surely they are none the better for that. Probably there is no writer who has been so widely read whose death would cause so little regret among the people whom he has attempted to benefit and please.

Mr. M. D. Conway's "South Coast Saunterings in England" lead him this month through a part of the Isle of Wight, and what he has to tell is very agreeable reading of the chatty, gossipy kind. Possibly it is some of the old leaven of the fighting, reforming spirit in him which leads Mr. Conway to speak so civilly as he does of John Wilkes. How any one is justified in speaking at any length of the "Essay on Woman"—even had

it been the ex-officio works of all the presidents and secretaries of all the existing societies for the abolition of all existing evils—without saying that it is a piece of unadulterated, unredeemed dirtiness, we do not understand.

"Anteros" is by Mr. Lawrence, the author of "Guy Livingstone," and has much of that author's peculiar charms. We do not yet see much of the regular Lawrence hero, but already we have a heroine, who efficiently pleads with us not to attack the author for breach of the implied contract between him and us. She is going to be more indecent, too. And then, the author we have with us always. Every now and then he in "Anteros" takes us aside, and gives us of his worldly wisdom in a way of which we shall never tire. "How otherwise, now, do you suppose that Lady Henscliffe had contrived to dispose of daughter after daughter, neither richly dowered nor passing fair, not only creditably, but so brilliantly as to move to hatred and malice all save the most charitable of her peers?" How, indeed? The question is one that but few would be equal to answering—or asking either, for that matter. Lawrence, though, can dispose of such problems—one down and another come on—by the hour together; and he does it so satisfyingly, that the greediest school-girl who ever pined for slate-pencil and chalk will contentedly wait as long as he chooses for the advent of Guy or Carryl.

The "Editor's Easy Chair," in this month's *Harper's*, is particularly good. Even the reference to Brook Farm, which Arcadia we are so unfortunate as to despise with a great contempt, does not, we find, hinder our enjoying the fine tribute to the power of Theodore Parker as a speaker which Mr. Curtis pays in his talk about the Boston Music Hall; and the little essay on Jenkins's Ear is very felicitously done. The length of Jenkins's ear, however, is almost precisely the length of the ears of the gentlemen and ladies who make use of him; and to hold them responsible for Jenkins's performances would be a better way of decreasing the great curse of the journalism of the moment than attacking Jenkins himself, who, for one thing, is not so very much to blame, and, for another, would not care a morsel if he were.

Putnam's is, on the whole, uninteresting, though "Sketches in Color" is pleasant; and "The Story of Crazy Martha," translated from the French of Jasmin, the barber-poet, is touching. This magazine seems to need editorial care. Much of what it has is passably good, and there appears to be independence in the management; at all events, many of the writers in it are unknown, and certainly were not admitted on the strength of their names, whether or not it was their merit that admitted them; but altogether *Putnam's* is dull.

The *Catholic World* for February will be found worth attention by the reader who takes any interest in the fight of the churches, and also by him who wishes to understand the intentions of the Romanists as regards our political system. This latter reader will need the gift of reading between the lines; for the *Catholic World* has some skill in preparing the way of its lord, and making his paths straighter than most Americans would think them if seen in the original plot. Still, there is a sufficiently plain assertion of extreme Ultramontanism in more than one of this month's essays, and throughout the magazine there is not only preaching, but preaching to presumed believers, in a creed which it is expressly said is above and beyond reason. Mere human beings will find the essay on "Church Music" instructive and pleasing; and the article about Mr. Ffoulkes's recent letter—in which a famous "pervert" from Anglicanism returns from Rome, and declares the Anglican a better church than the Roman—seems to put Mr. Ffoulkes in the wrong. However, inasmuch as the *World*—the questions involved being historical ones—is particular to wish for Mr. Ffoulkes "the grace of a genuine conversion," and is anxious that he may make large gains in "humility and obedience," we do not feel assured that there may not be something to be said on Mr. Ffoulkes's side. Meantime, happily, his book has been put upon the *Index*, and, whether it is wretchedly false or miserably true, nothing more is to be feared from it.

History of Athens County, Ohio, and incidentally of the Ohio Land Company and the First Settlement of the State at Marietta, etc., etc. By Charles M. Walker. (Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 1869.)—Most of our readers have probably never heard of the region concerning which Mr. Walker has filled six hundred octavo pages, in a manner deserving hearty acknowledgment; not only from the people whose history he records with so much industry and research, but from less partial critics. Obscure as it is, however, in the transactions of the present day, the county of Athens has played a highly important part in the development of the country. To it belongs the distinction of having been the first white settlement northwest of the Ohio, under the first territorial government, and of hav-

ing had the first university and the first public library in the same limits. It was, moreover, the scene of the first act of New England emigration, which was to transform the West, though not without altering the East. Its foremost surveyor, Gen. Rufus Putnam, of Massachusetts, suggested the six-mile township which has become the standard of national surveys; and he first recommended setting apart certain portions of townships for the benefit of schools. Dr. Manasseh Cutler, another of the fathers of the infant colony, obtained of Congress, in the Company's contract of purchase, an appropriation of land for the endowment of a university, which was subsequently established. He was a Yale man, and to him the county owes its name. Marietta he had dubbed *Adelphia*, its public squares *Quadrantion* and *Capitolium*, its chief road *Sacra via*, and its fort *Campus Martius*. But before condemning this misapplied classicism, or concluding that New England is responsible for all that the West has since been saddled with, we should remember that Jefferson signed in 1784 a Congressional Committee report, for dividing the Northwestern Territory into ten States, whose names, "beginning at the northwest, and proceeding southwardly, were to be: Sylvania, Michigania, Chersonasus, Assonisia, Metropotamia, Illinoia, Saratoga, Washington, Polypotamia, and Pelisipia."

Judge Ephraim Cutler, son of the divine, set up other landmarks worthy of his father's best. He was a member of the convention which framed the Ohio constitution, and he drafted the clauses relating to the judiciary, had a prominent share in carrying those which instituted a common-school system, and almost single-handed saved the State from slavery by resisting a proposed annulment of the ordinance of '87. Considering what effect this had upon the destiny of the entire West and of the Republic itself, it is difficult, merely upon this score, to estimate the weight which one small farming district has had in national affairs. The county has been far outstripped in productiveness by those for whose cultivation it opened the way; its university, bearing the name of the State, but reduced to four professors, three tutors, and fifty-two students, is behind all the State universities which were born of it; but its imprint on civilization, both west and east of the Alleghanies, remains, and will always remain. It has actually produced no great men, and has bred none so great as the founders. Mr. Stanbery, the late Attorney-General, and the Hon. Lewis Cass made here their professional debut; and Thomas Ewing was the first A.B. of the State and of the university. The common stock, nevertheless, recalls its New England origin. Out of a population of but 21,364, the county furnished 2,610 men to the army; yet could send, when Morgan made his raid into Ohio, 1,967 minute-men to oppose him—a remarkable illustration of the power of the North to resist invasion, while sustaining enormous forces in the field.

Mr. Walker has interspersed his narrative of the county and its several townships with many interesting scraps of personal reminiscence, extracts from private journals, and the like, and offers agreeable reading to any one fond of studying character, and ready to contrast our nation's present with its past. The names and dates which occur, the biographies of leading men, and the statistics studiously collected and arranged, will enhance the worth of Mr. Walker's labors from year to year, and be indispensable to the genealogist. We do not know how common town-histories may be in the West, but the county may pride itself on this, even if not the first; and the Ohio Valley Historical Series is certainly well continued by it.

The Gabled House; or, Self-Sacrifice. By the author of "The Climbers," "Paul Fenner," "Purpose," etc. (Philadelphia: Claxton, Remsen & Haffelfinger. 1869.)—This is a badly written story, yet we suppose it could hardly be bettered without making it, in some respects, even worse than it is at present. Taking it from the reader's point of view that is; for, as it stands, if there is not much pleasure to be found in considering the thought of the work, nor its character-drawing, nor yet the way in which its story is told, there is undoubtedly a sort of melancholy amusement to be got from its highly ornamental word-painting, and from its frequent lapses into a semi-rhythmic construction of its sentences, as if the author had put great restraints upon herself in the matter of capital letters, but otherwise had hardly been prevented from blank-verse. Her theory of the essentials required by an author would probably be found to be a neat paraphrase of what she states with respect to those of a teacher: "Scholarship is needful, and should be sought in a teacher," she says; "but affable manners and a firm Christian principle should be the foundation." And if we may judge from reading this one book of an author who has written at least three others, we should say that she thinks that a knowledge of English gram-

mar is needful, and should be sought for by a person proposing to write novels; but that an abundance of party-colored adjectives, and a facility in the construction of sentences without verbs, might after all prove to be her "best bolt." But if she wishes to make books which, like the imaginary one written by the heroine of her present story, shall be more commended than blamed by "the critics," and "live after the foam and fermentation have passed away;" or even if that be, as we fear, somewhat too daring an ambition, to write such as shall commend themselves as well by the simplicity of their style as by the excellence of their moral, it would be well for her to revise her present opinions, and give herself to the serious study of better models than those on which she has apparently formed her present style. There is an affectation about it, and that ought to go far towards neutralizing any good sought to be conveyed by means of it.

The Elements of Tachygraphy. Illustrating the first principles of the Art, with their adaptation to the wants of literary, professional, and business men. By David Philip Lindsley. (Boston: Otis Clapp. 1869.)—We have before this spoken favorably of the improvements which Mr. Lindsley has sought to introduce in phonography. In this little book the common style of tachygraphy is explained and illustrated, the briefer styles, intended for the use of verbatim reporters only, being left for future publication. The main advantages claimed for tachygraphy over the systems of short-hand now in use are these: (1) The skilful arrangement of the consonantal signs, by which those sounds which occur most frequently are represented by oblique and horizontal characters, avoiding as far as possible those stiff, perpendicular strokes which delay and tire the hand so much in phonography. (2) In the vowel signs, which are small semi-circles, dashes, dots, and diamond points, written in connection with the consonants, and in their proper order, so that the whole word can be written out without taking the pen from the paper. By this means the writer not only saves time, but, what is perhaps more important, secures far greater legibility than in those systems where the value of the vowel signs depends upon the position in which they are written. (3) The rejection of arbitrary signs and contractions, whose multiplicity has so complicated phonography as to render its acquisition extremely difficult. For the use of clergymen, editors, lawyers, students, and, in fact, all except verbatim reporters, tachygraphy seems to be preferable to the systems of phonography now in use. Those who have learned it have in a very short time attained a speed of from eighty to ninety words a minute—about three times as fast as they would write the common long-hand. Professional reporters, however, need still greater speed, as the average rate of public speaking is about one hundred and twenty words a minute, some speakers occasionally reaching as high as one hundred and eighty. But for this class Munson's "Complete Phonographer," prepared expressly for reporters, has left little to be desired.

Mr. Lindsley indulges the extravagant hope that tachygraphy will soon entirely supersede the common writing of the English speaking peoples; but men have grown old listening to similar anticipations from the phonetic reformers. It would have been better if the pages which are used in the introduction, in expressing a rather lofty conception of the influence which short-hand has exercised upon the progress of Christianity and civilization, had been devoted to still further illustrating and explaining the subject-matter of the book.

A Compendious Manual of Qualitative Chemical Analysis. By Charles W. Eliot, Professor of Analytical Chemistry in the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and Frank H. Storer, Professor of General and Industrial Chemistry in the same institution. (New York: Van Nostrand. 1869.)—Chemistry is not one of the sciences which most exercises the powers of observation; but qualitative analysis cannot be mastered unless the necessity for a strictly systematic and analytical method in the pursuit of any enquiry is learned at the same time. It is therefore probable that this branch of chemistry is the most useful as part of a general curriculum. In a class somewhat indiscriminately gathered there will naturally be found some who have a decided inaptitude for the subject, but it will not be found beyond the powers of any sound mind, provided the explanations in reference to manipulations are made so minute as to bring the subject to the level of the meanest capacity. This Messrs. Storer and Eliot seem to have succeeded in doing; and consequently their book will probably be found the best for students without a teacher, as well as for all classes which are to pursue a very elementary course. All mention of the spectroscope is omitted. This demonstrates that nothing has been inserted for

the mere purpose of making the book sell. But in this instance we should incline to think that the principle of giving the pupil not what he wishes but what he wants had been carried a little too far. It is certainly less against the interests of intellectual life to err upon the side of letting students follow their own bent too much than to err upon the side of too minute control.

A Treatise on the Law of Negligence. By Thomas G. Shearman and Amasa A. Redfield. (New York: Baker, Voorhis & Co. 1869.)—This treatise, as its preface claims, may fairly be considered a pioneer in its peculiar field. Its purpose was single and fixed. It intended to include all the law relating to negligence considered as a wrong, independent of contract, and nothing else, but, like many another pioneer, it found that it must here and there change its direction to include this or that object, which, though not in the direct line aimed at, was still in such close and parallel relation, or heretofore so neglected by other treatises, that it must be examined and reported on.

Here and there, in treatises devoted to master and servant, to bills and notes, to common carriers, a few chapters have been written to show what negligence, in the exercise of the particular acts therein treated of, would entail liability for injuries caused thereby; but these chapters were not complete in themselves, and by no means, even when taken together, mapped out the whole subject, which now Messrs. Shearman and Redfield have given us in this volume of seven hundred pages. The authors, then, have labored with no guide, the digests have been their mine, and the nearly four thousand cases which they have cited show how thoroughly they have worked it and how richly it has yielded.

In their preface, they modestly state that they could have done better if they had had several preceding works upon the same subject as a foundation; but we doubt it. As to certain subjects, such preceding works might be of great value to suggest order and arrangement, and especially would it have saved work in hunting authorities; but with regard to the subject of this treatise such precedents were not necessary, and they have adopted the arrangement which is natural and simple. To define the various degrees of care and negligence was the authors' first work, and this has been well done in the first two chapters on "The General Subject of Negligence" and "The Degrees of Negligence." Then follows a chapter on "Contributory Negligence" and another on "Parties to Action for Negligence."

Their next task was to relate clearly and concisely and accurately what care relieved from liability, and what negligence rendered liable, in certain entirely distinct relations. They have finished their definitions, and the table of contents hereafter shows everywhere the words "liability of," as of masters to servants, of servants to third parties, and so on.

The book is clearly and concisely written, and all the more so because the authors have been obliged to go over the ground for themselves. In the text, we have the law as decided by the courts, with no particular discussion of the cases, but with references to the notes where a discussion of the particular authority is frequently given—which method we consider preferable to that which discusses the cases at length in the text. A very useful and convenient index is added, and no law-book has been printed in better style.

Authors.—Titles.	BOOKS OF THE WEEK.	Publishers.—Prices.
Ante-Nicene Christian Library: Writings of Methodius, Alexander of Lycopolis, Peter of Alexandria, etc.	(Scribner, Welford & Co.)	\$3 50
Cox (S. S.), Search for Winter Sunbeams in the Riviera, Corsica, Algiers, and Spain	(D. Appleton & Co.)	3 00
Lenormant (F.) and Chevallier (E.), Students' Manual of Oriental History, Vol. I.	(J. B. Lippincott & Co.)	
L'Estrange (Rev. A. G. K.), Life of Mary Russell Mitford, 2 vols.	(Harper & Bros.)	
Philpotts (M. C.), The Manor Farm: a Tale	(J. B. Lippincott & Co.)	
Thomas (Annie), Only Herself: a Tale, swd.	(Harper & Bros.)	0 50
The Bible in the Public Schools: Legal Arguments, swd.	(Robt. Clarke & Co.)	
Trowbridge (Mrs. L.), Excelsior Cook-book	(Oakley, Mason & Co.)	
The Army Reunion, Dec. 15-16, 1868	(S. C. Griggs & Co.)	

Fine Arts.

THE THOMPSON COLLECTION OF PAINTINGS.

AN immense collection of pictures, of which much has been said and written, in and out of the daily papers, is to be sold in a few days at a Broadway salesroom. This gathering was made during the years 1845 to 1860 by a late citizen of Boston. It seems that the pictures have never been exhibited, nor even hung in any permanent place, private or public, and that, since 1860, they have been stored in Boston, almost wholly out of sight and out of reach. Many stories, not now to our purpose, are in circulation regarding the eccentricities of the collector and the reasons for this seclusion of his pictures.

Now that they are brought to light, offered for public examination and sale, and catalogued, the collection is found to be enormous in size, and exceedingly poor in quality; containing eighteen hundred works or thereabouts, but very few of any peculiar merit. There are, first, thirteen hundred numbers of miscellaneous oil paintings, some very large, of all sorts of mythological, historical, and ideal subjects. After this, and although many portraits appear in the above-named list, comes a new list of portraits only, containing three hundred and thirty numbers. About a hundred and fifty drawings of one kind and another, and a separate lot of studies of the nude, make up this enormous pile of "works of art;" the largest gathering of pictures, we think, that has ever been shown in New York. There are more than twice as many numbers in the catalogue as in the fullest catalogue ever issued by the Academy of Design.

The pictures fill three galleries; and all three have been well filled by the curious who have visited the collection. The sale of catalogues, alone, must have been remunerative.

Pictures "attributed to" great painters may be very poor, in almost every way, while one can see in them, at the same time, some ground, or at least some excuse, for their having been so attributed. Thus, a picture may be a copy by a painstaking pupil, and may show some hints and echoes of the master, while hopelessly inferior in all important qualities. This is a rather favorable case. Such pictures are set down as the work of the master so commonly, that hardly a gallery in Europe has a catalogue above suspicion. If such a picture is uninjured and unrestored, it may have a certain historical value. A worse case is that of the repainted picture, which may be by a pupil or an imitator; or may be even by the master himself, in the first place, but is now the work of no one so much as of the skill-less and remorseless "restorer." Pictures once completely repainted are destroyed—there is no other word for it—and can only be renewed, as if from the dead, by removing carefully every vestige of newly applied paint, and getting back the old work. This, which is a slow and expensive process, can only be resorted to for the purpose of saving pictures of considerable original value. The Thompson Collection contains very many pictures which are thus repainted to their ruin.

There are pictures among those attributed to distinguished painters, long ago dead, which seem to have had merit—which belong to the latter class mentioned above, and have lost whatever claim they may have had to be attributed as they are, since the brush of some irresponsible "restorer" has had its way with them. These pictures may be somewhat striking in treatment of the subject, in disposition of the masses, and the like, while they are otherwise valueless. After these come the herd of pictures, which are either "unknown"—and there are four or five hundred of these—or ascribed to this painter or to that, in reckless fashion, regardless of internal evidence. And in one or other of these two classes, nearly every canvas will find a place. The number of paintings worth any one's attention, even for a moment, is exceedingly small.

One mischief that such exhibitions as this one do is in the prejudice they excite, among those who have little knowledge of the history of painting, against every and all pictures that seem archaic or antiquated in subject, or treatment, or technical qualities. A really fine old picture, even if painted four hundred years ago, on a gold background, by an unknown workman, ought to please every one—has that in it which is capable of giving pleasure to all men—will give pleasure to every one who will give a little pains to the necessary preliminary study of the manner of treatment—the language, so to speak. Ancient styles of painting are to us like bygone states of our English tongue—we must become familiar with these before we can enjoy the poetry or the prose written in them. But such a collection as this one, recommended in advance to the admiration of the public as containing many fine works by old masters, and proving on examination very uninteresting to all beholders and very poor in the opinion of students of art, helps to discourage people from looking further into the matter of old painting.

This is the more to be regretted now that much talk and some preliminary action are going on about a Museum of Art. The difficulty of getting proper attention for the schools of art of the past, not made artificially popular by the imitation of them by modern schools, will be increased by every such discouragement. The first impediment in the way of our Art Museum here is, as we have said in former articles, the ignorance of most people in this country of what a Museum of Art may be and can be. To talk to these people about old pictures, and of the Demidoff sale which begins in February, while the Thompson Collection on exhibition here is also of "old pictures," is to talk in vain, and, more than that, to ensure yourself against being listened to at another time.

